THE GETTY CENTER LIBRARY

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR E. V. ARNOLD, Litt.D.

AND

F. W. HALL, M.A.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Chairman.*

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., *Hon. Treasurer.* Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

rof. GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D. Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.
rof. C. FLAMSTEAD WALTERS, M.A.
With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary representing the Council of the Classical Association.

CYRIL BAILEY, M.A., *Representing the Oxford Philological Society.*
Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A., *Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO; Sir W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., MONTREAL; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., MELBOURNE.

VOLUME XIII

PUBLISHED FOR THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION BY

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W.

AND

GINN & COMPANY, 15, ASHBURTON PLACE, BOSTON, MASS.

1919

THE GETTY CENTER
LIBRARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1.

PAGE

Actoris in the *Odyssey*. S. E. Bassett 1

The Scheria of the *Odyssey*. I. A. Shewan 4

Notes on the *Ecclesiazusae* of Aristophanes. T. L. Agar 12

'*Puncto tempore*.' W. M. Lindsay 19

Notes on Theocritus. A. S. F. Gow 20

The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy. F. H. Colson 24

The Phonetics of *MR-* in Latin. Edwin W. Fay 37

On the Meaning of ΒΑΔΗΝ and ΔΡΟΜΩΙ in Greek Historians of the Fifth Century. W. W. How 40

Lectio Senatus and *Census* under Augustus. E. G. Hardy 43

Professor Elmore's Hypotheses. E. G. Hardy 49

'Lombardic.' H. W. Garrod 51

Summaries of Periodicals:

Literature and General 53

No. 2.

The Scheria of the *Odyssey*. II. A. Shewan 57

Notes on Martial. A. E. Housman 68

Phaedriana. J. P. Postgate 81

Note on 'conspicior' in Liv. X. 43. G. J. Clemens 88

Corrigenda on 'The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy.' F. H. Colson . 88

Remarks on the Corpus Glossary. H. Bradley 89

Summaries of Periodicals:

Literature and General 109

Nos. 3, 4.

PAGE

Ennius and the Punic Wars. ETHEL M. STEUART 113

Some Glosses in the Text of Sophocles. A. C. PEARSON 118

Thucydides on the Third of August, 431 B.C. J. A. R. MUNRO . . . 127

Notes on the Greek Rhetors. HERBERT W. GREENE 129

Mulier Aries, and other *Cruces* in Catullus. O. L. RICHMOND 134

The Greek Adjectives ending in ης. RODERICK MCKENZIE 141

Siparum and *Supparus*. A. E. HOUSMAN 149

Euripides, *Rhesus* 720. ARTHUR PLATT 153

Notes on the *Birds* of Aristophanes. T. L. AGAR 155

Plato, *Republic* 421B. A. S. FERGUSON 163

A Ninth Century Commentary on Phocas. M. ESPOSITO 166

Aleuas and Alea. GRACE HARRIET MACURDY 170

Lucan I 99–103. J. S PHILLIMORE 172

On Lucretius II. 355–360. W. A. MERRILL 173

Summaries of Periodicals :

Literature and General 174

INDICES TO VOL. XIII. 181

ALTERATION OF PRICE.—*Owing to the increase in the cost of materials, the price of cases for binding volumes of the* CLASSICAL QUARTERLY *is advanced to* 2*s.* 6*d. These may be obtained from any bookseller; postage* 4*d. extra.*

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1919.

ACTORIS IN THE *ODYSSEY*.

PROFESSOR SCOTT in his paper on 'Eurynome and Eurycleia' (in the April number of the *Classical Quarterly*) was inclined to believe, although he did not press the point, that Eurynome and Actoris were one and the same servant, the name Actoris being a patronymic. This explanation was offered also by Hayman, who compares Actorion (Λ 750), but it has been ignored by Wilamowitz (*Hom. Unters.* 84 sq.) and by van Leeuwen-Mendes da Costa, who reject ψ 226 sqq. It is an ingenious attempt to solve a small Homeric problem, and would be convincing but for two reasons, of which the first has to do with the poet's manner and the second with the circumstances of the recognition scene in ψ.

It is not the custom of Homer to refer by patronymic alone to a minor character not well known to his audience. The Ithacan bard is called Terpiades in χ 330, but his given name Phemius follows in the next verse. Besides, the poet regularly describes, or at least characterizes briefly, the subordinate *dramatis personae* at their *first* appearance, if at all. Eurycleia (α 428-435), Dolius (δ 735-737), Melanthius (ρ 212), Eurynome (as ταμίη, σ 169), and Melantho (σ 321-325) are examples among the servants of the *Odyssey*. The swineherd can scarcely be regarded as an exception, since later he is to tell his own story to Odysseus. It is true that the Dulichian suitor Amphinomus is not described until the *second* of his five appearances (π 395-398), but this description is given less than fifty verses after he has been casually introduced (π 351), and shows no real deviation from the poet's rule. So it seems improbable that Actoris is the servant who has already appeared four or five times under a different name.

This improbability becomes greater when we consider the recognition scene. The *anagnorisis* depends for its effect on the absolute certainty of the test to which Penelope puts Odysseus. There must have been no possible means by which a stranger could have become aware of the peculiar structure of the nuptial couch. Yet if Actoris is Eurynome, then it was Actoris who

threw the coverlet over Odysseus (*υ* 4) and bathed him (*ψ* 154),[1] and it is conceivable that she might have given him—quite unintentionally—a hint of the all-important secret. Homer is too careful in his workmanship to permit such a possibility. Besides, we must note the words of Penelope (*ψ* 109 sq.), 'We twain have a token . . . *hidden from others*,' and the fact that all the verbs in the passage referring to Actoris (*ψ* 226-229) are in a past tense, especially *ὀπώπειν*, where the perfect would be more natural. We must conclude, I think, that Actoris is introduced only for the moment, and as an afterthought, and that she plays no part in the story of the *Odyssey*.

With Professor Scott's main thesis that Eurynome is needed in the story as the confidential servant of Penelope I fully agree, and should like to give some further evidence in support of his arguments—not implying, however, that they need strengthening.

In *β* 345-347 we are told that Eurycleia is stewardess of the great storeroom, where she sleeps, or at least has her office. This explains why she is never found with the queen as her personal attendant. Since flour and wine were kept in the *ὑψόροφος θάλαμος*, the latter would naturally be near the great Hall. Hence it is to be expected that Eurycleia should be present in the Hall in connection with the feasts of the Suitors.[2] In *ρ* 31 sqq. Telemachus sees her before he meets his mother, because she is preparing the Hall for the coming of the Suitors. In *υ* 128-159 she is again in charge of the maids who are working in the Hall. These passages lead us to infer that she has the general supervision of the main part of the palace rather than of the queen's apartments, and likewise show why she knows the true and the false maidservants (*τ* 497, *χ* 420-427). The twelve false maids are almost certainly those whose chief duties are in the great Hall,[3] and do not include the special attendants of Penelope: after the killing of the Suitors Eurycleia calls first the false women, who remove the bodies and clear the Hall (*χ* 431 sqq.), then 'the maids throughout the palace' (*χ* 495 sq.), and, lastly, Penelope and her attendants (*χ* 482 sq., *ψ* 1 sqq.), as Professor Scott points out. That there are no false maids immediately about the queen makes it possible for her to carry on the trick of the web successfully for three years.

Eurycleia is never found in attendance on the queen in the *hyperoon*, and in the two passages in which the plot requires her to be with Penelope the poet is careful to explain why she is there. In *δ* 716 sqq. Penelope, sitting on the threshold of the room in which she has been directing the work of the handmaids (i.e. she is not in the *hyperoon*), sobs piteously at the news of the departure of Telemachus and of the plot to slay him, 'and about her the women made plaintive moan,

[1] Rothe (*Widersprüche*, 27 sq.) has sufficiently answered the objections of Wilamowitz to this passage (*Hom. Unters.* 75 sq.).

[2] Also that she should serve chance arrivals and late-comers (*α* 139, *ρ* 94, 259), where she is very likely the unnamed *ταμίη*.

[3] Of course when their work in the Hall is done they card wool and spin under Penelope's direction, *σ* 314 sqq., cf. *δ* 683.

πᾶσαι, ὅσαι κατὰ δώματ' ἔσαν, νέαι ἠδὲ παλαιαί' (δ 720).

This verse, when read in connection with δ 682 sq., 'Was it to bid the slaves of divine Odysseus to stop their work and prepare a feast for *them*?' indicates clearly that the poet is explaining why Eurycleia happens to be with the queen: the maids who care for the great Hall are for the time not needed there, and have gone with Eurycleia to work at the wool. Vs. 720 would not be necessary if Eurycleia were regularly with Penelope, as Eurynome is.

In a similar way the poet accounts for the presence of the old nurse in the foot-washing scene (τ 344 sqq.). At the beginning of τ Eurycleia is told to keep the maids from the main apartments of the palace. After the arms have been removed and Telemachus has retired, Penelope enters the Hall with her attendants (note the plural, *κάτθεσαν*, τ 55; Eurynome is included, vs. 96). Then (τ 60) the other maids enter and clear away the remnants of the banquet; naturally Eurycleia is in charge of them.

There are only four passages in which we are not told where the old nurse is (β 348, τ 15, φ 380, χ 394); in each of these it is easier to understand that she is in charge of the maids, if not at her office in the storeroom, rather than in personal attendance on the queen.

On the other hand, it is natural that Eurynome, and not Eurycleia, should provide Odysseus with a coverlet after he has laid himself down to sleep in the vestibule (υ 4)—an incident which provokes the scorn of Wilamowitz (*op. cit.*, 62 sq.), yet is flawless notwithstanding. Penelope has offered the stranger a comfortable bed, but he has declined it (τ 317 sqq.). Eurycleia would be likely to respect his wishes in this matter (cf. τ 337 sq.), the more since he has warned her (τ 482 sqq.) not to indicate his presence to anyone, for the giving of a *chlaina* to a beggar might arouse comment if it were known to the Suitors. But Eurynome thinks only of her mistress's reputation (cf. τ 325 sqq.) and of the interest which she has taken in the beggar.[1]

Finally, it is entirely natural that Eurynome, and not Eurycleia, should bathe Odysseus (ψ 154). The old nurse is infirm for such a task (cf. *ὀλιγηπελέουσά περ*, τ 356) and the other maids are dancing (ψ 132-151). This dancing, be it noted, leaves only the two confidential maidservants as witnesses of the recognition—there would have been many others but for the bath and the dance—and also shows why these two, most appropriately, as Professor Scott remarks, should prepare the couch so long vacant.

SAMUEL E. BASSETT.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT,
BURLINGTON, VERMONT, U.S.A.

[1] We may infer that Eurynome has first lighted Penelope to her *hyperoon*, and then has returned to do what she can for the comfort of the beggar.

THE SCHERIA OF THE *ODYSSEY*.

I.

Two main views of the country called in the *Odyssey* the Land of the Phaeacians or Scheria are current among Homeric scholars. Some think it is, or is in, the island known to the ancients as Corcyra, and that the people who are described as living in it were ordinary flesh and blood mortals. The other view, the belief of the majority, though of great variety, is that Scheria is in fairyland or some other supramundane sphere, and a creation of the poet's fancy. In *Class. Rev.* XXIV. 204 Mr. Evelyn-White says, after quoting Monro, that it 'cannot be disputed' that the Phaeacian and other adventures of Odysseus are *Märchen*, so the matter is as good as closed. But as many of the Homeric *choses jugées* of last century have been proved of recent years to be unsubstantial, it has seemed worth while to examine the fairyland theory afresh. I begin with a survey of the literature of the question, and shall then inquire in a second paper what Homeric foundation there is for the supernatural theory. Elsewhere I shall endeavour to show that Homer describes a real people, and that Scheria can be fitted into the Mediterranean world, as we now know it, of the latest Minoan or Mycenaean period, and is in fact a Minoan settlement in Corcyra.

Perhaps the most famous of the papers which have developed the extraterrestrial idea is Welcker's *Die homn. Phäaken u. d. Inseln der Seligen* in *Rhein. Mus.* I. 219 sqq. Briefly, he holds that the Phaeacian story is based on the northern one told by Procopius, that there was a race of Ferrymen of the Dead, who conveyed the shades of the departed to the Island of Brettia, for which cp. Stjerna, *Essays on Beowulf*, 103 sqq., and *Folk-Lore*, XXIX. 55, referring to Tylor. As the Phaeacians are habitual πομποί, using ships that flit over the sea enveloped in mist, and as they escort Odysseus home while he is fallen on a sleep as deep as death itself, they are obviously ferrymen of the kind. If that be the root idea of Homer's narrative, it must be allowed that the ferrymen have become *diablement changés*, seeing that their Homeric representatives are a gay, light-hearted people, ῥεῖα ζώοντες, and having dealings only with living men. Perhaps it was some consciousness of this *reductio ad absurdum* that led Welcker to go on to suggest that Homer has endued these ghostly functionaries with the manners and customs of his own Ionia. The further objection has been taken that it is hardly likely that the northern legend had reached Greece at the early period to which we must refer the Phaeacian episode, or at least its *Kern*. Had it done so, we might

have expected more references to it in the literature of the thousand years before Procopius' day. On these grounds Nitzsch, *Anmkgn. zu Homers Od.* III. xxxii., approved of Klausen's refutation of Welcker. Cp. the more recent rejection in Roscher, *s.v. Phäaken*, 2218.

Another explanation that has found some favour is Gerland's in his *Altgriechische Märchen in d. Od.* He sees in the Phaeacian story a fairy-tale akin to that of Śaktideva in the Sanskrit collection *Somadeva*, and enumerates the resemblances. The hero of the Sanskrit story is saved from a whirlpool by clinging to a fig-tree,[1] and then comes to the fairy country of the Vidhyādaris, who are ruled by a beautiful queen, whom the hero does not wed. Instead he returns home and marries an old love. It is argued that the story is *Gemeingut* of the Aryan race. Monro, *Odyssey*, XIII.-XXIV. 293, agrees, on Gerland's showing, that 'the Phaeacian episode is distinctly *märchenhaft*,' and, *Academy* of October 22, 1870, 24, that the resemblances between the tale and the Phaeacian episode are obvious. So Butcher and Lang, XX. But the points of similarity are common to many fairy-tales, and Jevons, *Hist. Greek Lit.* 19, observes that, as the *Somadeva* was not compiled till about 1200 A.D., there was plenty of time for the Greek story to reach and become popular in Hindustan, just as a Sanskrit tale came west and was incorporated in the *Arabian Nights*. Gruppe, *Griech. Mythol.* 398, n. 4, who himself derives the 'myth of the Phaeacians' from a Helios-Poseidon legend, finds the Indian parallels doubtful. Cp. Mannhardt, *Antike Feld- u. Waldkulte*, 108, and Krause, *Tuisko-Land*, 602 sqq. To the latter the Vidhyādharis are *Walküren*. Parallels are easy to trace in such cases. There is an instructive passage in Miss Stawell's *Homer and the Iliad*, 124 sq., in which the resemblances between the story of the *Odyssey* and the North American Tale of the Red Swan are drawn out in full, but no one would infer an original connexion between the two.

Gerland's view of the genesis of the Phaeacian tale must also be unacceptable to those who have of recent years come to the conclusion—on the *non dulce ni tecum* read into ζ 244 sqq. and θ 457 sqq., and other faint indications—that in its original form there *was* a marriage, and that Nausikaa did not remain behind 'widow'd of her heart's desire.' This interpretation is due to van Leeuwen, *Mnemos.* XXXIX. (now in his *Commentt. Homericae*), and Mr. Paton, in *Class. Rev.* XXVI. 259, considers it to be 'quite certain.' A wedding is also discovered by those who see in the story a nature-myth. It is the union of the *Frühlingsgott* Odysseus with the *Erdgottin* Nausikaa. See e.g. Osterwald, *Hermes-Odysseus*, 111 sqq. Eitrem, *Die Phaiakenepisode in der Od.*,

[1] This is one point of resemblance — cf. μ 432 sq. — which is deemed very striking. But it is to be noted that it is no part of the Phaeacian story, and, further, that the 'fig-tree' is not the same in the two tales. The ἐρινεός of the *Odyssey* is the wild progenitor of the edible fig (*Ficus Carica*). The tree in the *Somadeva* is the banyan (*Ficus Indica*), made famous by the description in *Paradise Lost* XI. 1101 sqq. Cp. Tawney's Translation of the *Kathā Sarit Sāgara* I. 220. Reading this story of Śaktideva in that collection, and others in it, I do not feel impressed by the resemblances: and perhaps too little attention has been paid to the differences. In the *Arabian Nights* (Lane, Vol. iii. 7) a hero similarly saves himself by clinging to a branch.

concludes that Odysseus really made a 'long stay' in Scheria, in which case he would hardly escape matrimony. But others have held that he remained but one day.

Bender, *Die märchenhaften Bestandtheilen der homn. Gedichte*, 25 sqq., enumerates points of coincidence with the Mongolian tale of Gesser Khan. The resemblances are at least as striking as those in Gerland's Indian parallel, but Bender's conclusion is different. He argues borrowing by Mongolia. For points of community with an old Egyptian story and with the adventures of Sindbad (so also Eitrem, *op. cit.* 29), see Gruppe, *op. cit.* 711 n., and von Kralik, *Homeros*, 359, 376. Jensen, in *Das Gilgamisepos*, as I see from a review, finds striking resemblances between the Odysseus legend and Semitic sagas.

Those, and they are not a few, who make Odysseus a Sun God,[1] have no difficulty in explaining Phaeacia as the Realm of Darkness or a Region of the Underworld, from which the God of Day or of Light or of Spring emerges in all his glory. For particulars of such views see *Der Urmythus der Od.* by Menrad, and Rossbach's *Castrogiovanni*, 27 sqq. Menrad, however, cannot bring himself to believe that the episode is an essential part of the *Mythenzyklus des Sonnenhelden*. Van Leeuwen, *op. cit.* 55 sq., sees in the solar myth, in which the sun emerging from darkness is made a hero, who is given a convoy by the *Phaeaces sive Furvi mortuorum portitores*, one of the *incongrua* which went to the construction of the epic. Seeck's conclusion as to a *Sonnenmythus* in his *Quellen der Od.* is well known. Trenkel, *Zur Phäakis u. Telemachie*, starts from it; Phaeacia is *Schattenland*. There the *sterbende Naturgott*, according to E. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Alt.* II. 103, is in the power *der grauen Männern* (*Phaeaken*). Compare his essay in *Hermes* XXX. 258 sqq., the 'combinations' in which are questioned by Kretschmer, *Einleitung*, 282 n., and Osterwald, *op. cit.* 84— the god of spring returning with blessings from the *Unterweltinsel* Scheria. So Harder, *Homer*, 90. On all which see the sound observations by Kroll, *Sage u. Dichtung in N. Jbb.* 1912, 161 sqq., and Scott in *C.P.* XII. 244 sqq. The latter, yielding for the moment to the *Lust des Fabulierens*, proves that General Lee himself was a solar avatar.

In another phase of the interpretation the Phaeacians are Spirits, generally of a beneficent disposition. Ploix, *Le Mythe de l'Odyssée*, 176, classes them with the fairies, common in all tales, who appear in a crisis to help the unfortunate hero, supplying him with treasure and a wife. Specifically, they are the inhabitants of *le pays de la lumière*, which agrees with Gerland's suggestion that they were *Lichtelben*, and differs *toto caelo* from the conception of 'the grey men.' Gruppe, *op. cit.* 398, supposes they were originally Spirits of the Winds, and finds an analogy in seamen's stories, as that of the Flying Dutchman. Cp. Trenkel, *op. cit.* 13. So Müllenhof, quoted by Mannhardt, *ut supra*, and Preller-Robert, 628 sq. Klausen, *Die Abenteuer des Ods.*, makes

[1] Siecke, in *Hermes der Mondgott*, 38, says a Moon God. He does not appear to deal with the adventure in Phaeacia, which presumably must be interpreted as an eclipse.

them Daemons of the Waves, and Von Kralik, 262 sqq., *die guten Genien der See, Schutzgeister.* Schwartz, *Nachklänge prähist. Volksglaubens in Hom.* 17 sqq., goes to the clouds. The Phaeacians are *Wolkenschiffer.* They came from Hypereia, which is obviously heaven (so also Usener, *Götternamen*, 20), though in Hypereia they were the neighbours of the Cyclopes, whom it is startling to find in the celestial sphere. For an enthusiastic exposition of the cloudland belief, see Cox, *Mythol. of the Aryan Nations*, II. 274 sqq.

But all are not agreed as to the beneficent character. Eitrem thinks the Phaeacians—when, so to speak, in embryo—were *χαλεποί* and *ἄγριοι.* Their descent from Poseidon seems to suggest the same thing to Adam, *Aufbau d. Od.* 25. Gercke appears to have discovered that the gentle lady Arete was originally an ogress, a view which Cauer, *Grundfragen*[2], 477, rightly considers an outrage on the poetry. This conception is generally based on *η* 30 sqq., where the words are spoken by Athene, and are obviously an *Augenblicksäusserung.* See Rothe, *Od. als Dichtung*, 255, and Dachs, *Die λύσις ἐκ προσώπου*, 70, and cp. Scott in *C.J.* XIII. 215.

Many inquirers, again, without making detailed examination, and not always expressly agreeing with any of the leading theories already mentioned, intimate their general concurrence in the *märchenhaft* view. The Phaeacians are an imaginary people, and their country a Land of Cockaigne, a Utopia, a *Weissnichtwo*, a *Nirgendwo*, a *Schlaraffenland*, as unreal as Camoens' Isle of Loves. The view was not unknown in antiquity—see Lehrs, *Aristarchus*[3], 244, and cp. Eustath. on *η* 118—*ἐκτοπίζων τὴν Φαιακίαν ὡς εἴπερ νῆσος ἦν τις μακάρων τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἀνεξέλεγκτος.* And how general such opinions are at the present time among Homerists of all attitudes to the poems the following brief references will show. Mangold, *La Ville Homérique*, 15, and Sikes on *ζ* 241 (ideal); Mackail, *Homer*, 1905, 15 (enchanted city); Hall, *Oldest Civilization*, 258 n. (probably purely imaginary); Browne, *Handbook*, 187 (half-supernatural); Bursian, *Geogr.* II. 355 sqq. (a fairy paradise); G. Lang, *Geogr. d. Od.* 112 (ideal picture of Ionian life); Seymour, *Life in the Homeric Age*, 318, and Geddes, *Problem*, 75 (fairyland); Hergt, *De Ulixis Erroribus*, 42 (fabulous); Lehrs, *Kl. Schriften*, 61 (a wonder-folk); Heubach, *Od. als Kunstwerk*, and Keller, *Homc. Society*, 25 sqq. (imaginary, based on Phoenician materials); and Groeger in *Rhein. Mus.* LIX. 22 sqq. (the Phäakis an imitation of the late book Ω, with old *Märchengut* incorporated). And I see from references that Wilamowitz has, in the *Internationale Monatsschrift* for June, 1914, contended that Phaeacia is *Phantomland.*

In regard to the localization of the Phaeacians, the Fairyists generally hold that Homer conceives them as a race dwelling in some Isle of the Blest, for he describes their country as one of much amenity, and themselves as having some connexion with Rhadamanthys, who, according to *δ* 564, is on the Elysian Plain. The view is, as we have seen, as old as Eustathius, and Welcker adopted it. Rohde, however, *Psyche*, 75, n. 2, characterized the idea that the Phaeacians as *Fährleute des Todes* stood in any relation to Elysium as

nichts als eine haltlose Phantasie. But to Rhadamanthys we shall have to return later.

Allegory, as Lawton observes, *Art and Humanity in Homer*, 193, does not appear, so far, to have been discovered in the Phaeacian episode.

The explanation given by Fries in *Das Zagmukfest auf Scheria* is in a category by itself. Fries is imbued with the importance of the influence of the old oriental world on early Greece, and has viewed the Greek gods and heroes in a separate treatise *vom astralmythologischen Standpunkt.* The doings in Scheria he regards as not invented, but as an annual *Akt des Kultlebens*, the installation of the God of Light or *Jahresheld* in his new realm. The interpretation of the evidence seems forced, and it does not appear that the exposition has been found convincing, but I am not sure that the grounds are either less numerous or less cogent than those which have readily appealed to the Fairyists.

Between the supramundane and the mere earthly explanations of Scheria comes one that is favoured by Dr. Leaf. In *The Times* of January 19, 1909, Mr. Frost broached the view, afterwards developed in *J.H.S.* XXXIII. 189 sqq., that Plato's Atlantis is really Minoan Crete, and he has incidentally suggested that the Odyssean account of Scheria is a reflection of that island in the day of its greatness.[1] 'The picture given by the poet is substantially true of the great period of the Palace of Cnossus, but quite unlike that of Crete as he knew it.' Dr. Leaf follows, *Homer and History*, 183 sq., and asks if Scheria is not Homer's name for Plato's Atlantis. We are to 'consider whether the Phaeacians who, in Nausikaa's words, "care not for bow and arrow, but only for masts and oars and ships," may not fairly remind us of the men of Knossus, who, secure in the rule of the sea, never cared to fortify their palace by the shore.' But this surely tells absolutely against the identification. A land in which the bow is despised cannot be Crete at any stage of its ancient history, and the Phaeacians, who were—again to quote Nausikaa—secure against attack by sea, did nevertheless, unlike their Minoan prototypes, carefully fortify their settlement on the coast.

But I am not concerned to deny Minoan features to Scheria; in fact, I agree that they exist. But this Atlantid theory raises two questions, first, whether Minoan Crete can be identified with Plato's Atlantis, and, second, whether Scheria can be accepted as a sort of image or mirage of Minoan Crete.

On the first point I cannot of course discuss Mr. Frost's argument here at length, but there is one prime difficulty which he himself specifies, and which, it appears to me, is not to be surmounted. Plato's Solon's Egyptian friend's Atlantis is outside the Pillars of Hercules. Crete is in the Mediterranean, some 1,300 miles from Gibraltar, but only some 350 from Egypt, whence this story purports to have come. Why should it be transported

[1] Osterwald, *op. cit.* 90, had thought of Atlantis. But he wrote in 1853, long before the archaeologist had restored the Minoan Age.

1,000 miles west of its proper site, and why should its existence be thrown back 9,000 years and its extent magnified to an area greater than Libya and Asia? In process of folk-memory, if not in that of Egyptian priests, all this might of course have taken place, but there seems to be very little ground for believing that it did. On the other hand, there have always been those who have held that the legend of a great island or continent out in the Atlantic, which was eventually submerged, had a basis in fact. Mr. Frost easily disposes of the belief by the statements that there have been some 'palpably absurd' theorizings about Atlantis, which is doubtless true, and that 'it is geologically certain that no such subsidence in the Atlantic or Mediterranean has taken place in human times, or at least since palaeolithic man.' When and by whom was this made certain? Mr. Frost refers, for authority, to the discussion in M. Martin's *Études sur le Timée de Platon*. But Martin was presumably no geologist, and consequently no authority himself, and he wrote nearly eighty years ago. I have difficulty in obtaining access to the literature of the subject, and the *Encycl. Brit.* s.v. Atlantis unfortunately does not help, but I gather from the works I have consulted that scientific opinion is divided. This is distinctly stated in a very recent book, *The Myths of Crete*, by Mr. D. A. Mackenzie, 97 sqq.; and Sergi, *The Mediterranean Race*, 58, quotes V. Tissot and D'Arbois de Jubainville as believers in the lost continent. See also Atlantis in Smith's *Dict. Geogr.;* Berlioux, 'Les Atlantes,' in *Annuaire de la Faculté des Lettres de Lyon*, 1883; and Warren, *Paradise Found*, 38, and cp. 184, where the *Phaedrus*, 275 B, is quoted, 'but, O Socrates, you can easily invent Egyptians or anything else.' But I refrain from quoting authorities on Plato. It is enough to say here that this standing controversy in the scientific world must be resolved before any outsider can be dogmatic either way.[1]

But it is not the only difficulty. Minoan Crete was well known in Egypt till the destruction of its capital, and intercourse between the two countries was frequent. Now it is hardly to be supposed that such intercourse then ceased to exist altogether, or that it was so rare that the Egyptian authorities and priests forgot all about the great island realm, and its destruction by 'a real historical person,' Theseus (Mr. Frost, approved by Dr. Leaf, *op. cit.* 280), or that the memories which, *ex hypothesi*, they retained of its glories, became entirely dissociated from it. And, if only some dim recollection once connected in tradition with Crete at its zenith did float about Egypt, it is surely as likely that the features that survived became attached to an Atlantis familiar in tradition, whether or not it was real in fact, as that Crete should be moved out into the Atlantic ocean and become to the Egyptian world something no better than a sort of Camelot, or 'realm of shadowy palaces.'

This, however, is a matter on which scholars will no doubt come to a conclusion in course of time. The important question for present purposes is, what ground there is for believing that in the *Odyssey* Homer has given

[1] A friend has sent me the *Occult Review* for January, 1913, and copies of *Light* for March, 1917. What value can be assigned to the papers in them on Atlantis I am unable to say.

memories of Minoan Crete a local habitation and a name[1] in Scheria. It seems to me there is very little. Drerup in his *Homer*[1], 129 sqq., cp. his *Omero*, 265 sq., suggests that the origin of the *Odyssey* is to be found in Crete. Professor Burrows accepts this, *Discoveries*, 208, and others, as Kranz on the *Irrfahrten*, *Hermes*, 1915, do the same. For a criticism in detail of this idea see Belzner, *Land u. Heimat des Odysseus*, note on 34 sqq., and cp. Cauer, *Erfundenes u. Überliefertes bei Homer*, in *N. Jbb.* 1905, 16. Finsler, *Homer*[2], 23, accepts, but allows that in what he calls the 'final redaction' of the *Odyssey* Scheria is conceived as in Corcyra.

Professor Burrows goes on to suggest that 'the Phaeacians themselves, mariners, artists, feasters, dancers, are surely the Minoans of Crete,' and agrees with Drerup that, when Alkinoos says Odysseus shall be taken home, even if that home be further than Euboea, whither the Phaeacians once conveyed Rhadamanthys—who, it is noted, was Minos' twin-brother—the secret is out. I leave this mention of Rhadamanthys for later consideration; it is not certain that there was only one of the name, or, if there was, that that one was in origin a Cretan. But how can it be held that the comparison with Euboea is a bad one 'if the point of view, as is ordinarily held, is that of Corcyra, a good one if it is that of Crete'? I cannot understand the argument. How could Euboea be regarded as an *Vltima Thule* to Crete? The voyage between is a comparatively short, straight, easy run through the islands; from Corcyra it is a long roundabout past all the dangerous southern promontories of Greece. And if, as many have believed with good reason, the poet conceived there was to the north of Greece an open sea, which would be as mysterious and unexplored as that to the west, my argument is certainly not weakened. In short, if Crete be taken as the starting-place, there is little meaning in Alkinoos' remark. Mr. Frost and Dr. Leaf add nothing on this point. It is almost as hard, no doubt, to prove a mere memory as to prove a negative.

I leave for the present the similarities traced between the life of the Phaeacians and the life of the Minoans. Here I will only say that it seems to me it would be strange if Homer constructed Phaeacia out of memories of Minoan Crete, seeing that he knows both the Crete of his own day, *ὅθι Μίνωος γένος ἐστίν*, and its Minoan past equally well. It is unnecessary to quote references. Minos, Deucalion, Daedalus, and Ariadné are all real enough to him. For contemporary Crete there is, not to mention the *Catalogue*, the famous account of the island in τ 172 sqq., on which and its fidelity to fact see Professor Myres in *J.H.S.* XXVII. 176. That the poet should wish in addition to have a Crete in the western seas is hard to think. It is his appropriation of Corfu for the Taphians—on which see *Class. Rev.* XXX. 82—that has led Dr. Leaf to embrace the notion. He had to provide for the Phaeacians somehow, and Atlantis was heard a-calling.

I now resume after this Cretan digression, and turn to those—there have always been a faithful few—who have believed the poet was describing a real

[1] I do not think that among the numerous attempted derivations of the name there is, so far, any explanation by the Cretists that would suit their theory.

locality and a real people. I need not dwell on identifications which have been treated as mere curiosities from their birth, such as those with the Canaries (Jarz, Cailleux, Kirchenbauer), Gadeira or Cadiz (Breusing), Trapani in Sicily (Butler), and even Palestine[1] (Schreiner). But at all times there have been inquirers who have been impressed with the evident reality of Phaeacia, some even adhering to the Corcyra tradition. Nägelsbach, *Hom. Theol.*[3] *Anhang*, 188, put the Phaeacians on a par with the Aethiopians, Leleges, Teleboans, and Taphians, all of whom, he says, have mythical characteristics. But, such traits notwithstanding, it has always been believed that these peoples actually lived in the flesh. For some other early believers see the remarks *Ueber die Lage Scherias* in Nitzsch's *op. cit.* II. 72 sqq. Nitzsch himself, though he adheres generally to the fairyland notion, admits Homer may have had Corcyra in mind. Forbiger, *Handbuch d. alt. Geogr.* III. 1011, thought it highly probable Scheria was Corcyra. Cp. Schlichthorst, *Geog. Homeri*, 53, 59 sqq., 118 n., and Brown, *Handbook*, 189. Zimmerer, in a paper *Scheria das Land der Phäaken*, 1892, known to me only from a report of its contents, contended for Corcyra, placing Hypereia, the Phaeacians' old home, in Epirus. Dörpfeld is convinced he will find the remains of Scheria in Corfu. Gruhn is strong for reality, though singular in making, in his *Kyklopen u. Phäaken*, Corfu Thrinakié, and locating the Phaeacians in Leukas. For the works of Mustoxidi, a native of Corfu and an enthusiastic defender of its claim, see Bursian, *Geogr.* 359 n. Hayman also favoured Corfu, Vol. II., Pref. lxxxv. Champault, in his *Phéniciens et Grecs en Italie d'après l'Odyssée*, identifies Scheria with Ischia. Gladstone, of course, accepted Corfu. Hypereia, he thought, *Synchronism*, 242 sq., was on the north coast of Africa. Others have thought it was in the same region. Colonel Mure took it to be Hipparis in Sicily. Mr. Leask, *Engl. Hist. Rev.* 1888, 293, would identify it with the heights of Aram as opposed to the lowlands of Canaan, and would find in this confirmation of Herodotus' account of the original habitat of the Phoenicians. Pasteris, *I miti inferni in Omero*, 70 sq., suggests Hypereia may be '*l'Alta Asia* (=ὑπέρ—Ἀσία ?),' and thinks of Tyre, and it is curious that Merry and Riddell on ζ 263 remark on the similarity of the topography of Scheria to that of Tyre. Finally, Bérard, in *Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée*, has, after a minute and patient investigation on the spot, proved, I venture to think, that Scheria is a site, known to-day as Palaiocastrizza, on the north-west coast of Corfu.

From this detailed review it appears that after centuries of discussion, mainly based, as we shall see, on a few facts in the narrative which have not been carefully weighed, nothing has been settled. The efforts of the Fairyists have been as infructuous as those of the enucleators of the Kernel of the *Iliad*. But as the extracosmical view is so generally held, I shall in a second paper consider the indications in the Homeric text on which it is based and try to assess their real evidential value.

A. Shewan.

St. Andrews.

[1] So some 'learned man' in Dodwell's time. See his *Tour through Greece*, I. 32. Alkinoos is Solomon!

NOTES ON THE *ECCLESIAZUSAE* OF ARISTOPHANES

233 *ὡς τοὺς στρατιώτας πρῶτον οὖσαι μητέρες*
σώζειν ἐπιθυμήσουσιν· εἶτα σιτία
τίς τῆς τεκούσης μᾶλλον ἐπιπέμψειεν ἄν ;

It is not without some reason that R. has *ἐπιθυμήσουσιν* and the other MSS. *ἐπιθυμοῦσιν* which spoils the metre. We may, I think, infer that the original reading was in all probability *ἐπιθύσουσιν*, 'will be set on saving,' a strong expression, cf.

Hymn. Herm. 475 *ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τοι θυμὸς ἐπιθύει κιθαρίζειν,*

Σ 174 *οἱ δὲ ἐρύσσασθαι ποτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν*
Τρῶες ἐπιθύουσι.

The future is a clear necessity, and so there is no reason whatever why *ἐπιθυμήσουσιν* should have become *ἐπιθυμοῦσιν*. On the other hand *ἐπιθύσουσιν* would almost inevitably be changed to the better known *ἐπιθυμοῦσιν* and then to R.'s *ἐπιθυμήσουσιν*.

In point of meaning 'will ardently desire' is preferable to 'will desire,' which last could be said of the men quite as well as of the women. There is a great difference between 'wishing for' a thing and going 'straight for' it (*ἐπ' ἰθύς*).

292 *στέργων σκοροδάλμῃ.*

The scholiast's *ἡδόμενος σκορόδοις. καὶ τοῦτο ἄγροικον ἐμφαίνει* might serve if the reading were trustworthy. Bentley saw it was not and suggested *κἀρεύγων σκοροδάλμην*. Probably the true reading is:

ῥέγχων σκοροδάλμῃ,

'snorting with garlic-pickle,' in other words, 'like a game-cock primed with garlic,' ready for a set-to, prepared to 'come down' heavily on someone, as we might say, cf. *Achar.* 166 *ἐσκοροδισμένοις*, *Knights* 494, 946 *ἐσκορόδισας*, 1095 *σκοροδάλμην*, *Peace* 509. The general picture of the ecclesiast here is much the same as that of Philocleon in the *Wasps*, cf. 168 *μέγα τι δρασείει κακόν*, 320 *βούλομαί γε πάλαι—κακόν τι ποιῆσαι*; they are both bent on mischief. *Στέργων* utterly ruins the humour of the description.

Moreover *κεκονιμένος* just preceding does not mean, as we are told on the same authority, *οἷον σπουδάζων πάνυ καὶ σχεδὸν κόνεως πεπληρωμένος*; but 'prepared for a tussle,' like a wrestler with *κονία* 'soaped' to make him less,

not more, easily grasped by an opponent, and in harmony with all this comes the concluding touch *βλέπων ὑπότριμμα*, 'with a vinegar face,' not *στέργων* at all. He is not satisfied or pleased or in love with anything.

306 *ἐν ἀσκιδίῳ φέρων*
πιεῖν ἅμα τ' ἄρτον †αὖ
**καὶ δύο κρομμύω*
καὶ τρεῖς ἂν ἐλάας.

So the MSS., though some omit *αὖ*. There are several emendations *αὖον* (Reiske), *αὐτῷ* (Velsen), *ἂν καὶ πρός* (Porson). The first of these seems better than the second, as the provisions could hardly be intended for anyone but himself. *Cela va sans dire.* The point is not that they were not shared with others but that they were scanty. Porson's attempt need not be criticized. Bentley suggested *ἕνα* instead of *αὖ*, leaving a short syllable at the end of the line. B. B. Rogers had the same idea, but abandoned it from the consideration just mentioned. The solution I would recommend utilizes it thus:

πιεῖν ἕνα τ' ἄρτον αὖ-
ον καὶ δύο κρομμύω.

Possibly *φέρων | τι πῶμ' ;* for *φέρων πιεῖν* is not quite an unexceptionable expression for *φέρων οἶνον* or *ὕδωρ* or whatever it might be.

365 *ἆρ' οἶδ' Ἀμύνων ; ἀλλ' ἴσως ἀρνήσεται.*

The last three words show sufficiently that the first three should not make a question. So Meineke and others read *ἀλλ' οἶδ' . . .* The true reading is evidently *ἀτὰρ οἶδ'*, one syllable having been lost, cf. 376, 394 for *ἀτάρ*.

381 *ἀλλ' ὕστερος νὴ ἦλθον, ὥστ' αἰσχύνομαι*
μὰ τὸν Δι' οὐδέν' ἄλλον ἢ τὸν θύλακον.

The second of these lines has been emended in various ways which I cannot now set forth in detail by various scholars *v.* Rogers's Note in the Appendix to his valuable edition. The tradition, however, as given above affords a quite satisfactory meaning, and any change would be a step in the wrong direction. 'I came too late,' says Chremes, 'and for that I blush before no one else by Zeus, but—and then comes unexpectedly, treated as if it were a person—my wallet.'

For this use of *αἰσχύνομαι* which is not superabundantly, but still quite sufficiently, established compare:

Thesmoph. 903 *αἰσχύνομαί σε τὰς γνάθους ὑβρισμένη.*
Eur. *Ion* 934 *αἰσχύνομαι μέν σ', ὦ γέρον, λέξω δ' ὅμως.*

Here Dobree was mistaken in removing the pronoun.

Plato, *Sympos.* 216B *τὸ αἰσχύνεσθαι ὀντινοῦν.*

404 *τί δαί μ' ἐχρῆν δρᾶν ;*

Ἐχρῆν is Brunck's correction of *χρῆν*, the reading of the Munich MS. Hall and Geldart, I note, attribute *χρῆν* to the Aldine and retain it, but both readings are wrong. The best supported reading is *με χρή* (R. F. P.[1]), which is undoubtedly right, as I shall show. Its universal rejection is an error. A slight but vital correction, however, is needed. The purblind Neocleides says at the top of his voice (*ἀναβοήσας*) and making a general appeal to the assembly (*περιβλέψας*) :

τί, δῆμε, χρὴ δρᾶν ;

'What ought our policy to be, O people ?'

This appeal Blepyrus chooses to take, without altering a letter, as

τί δή με χρὴ δρᾶν ;

and proceeds to say that, if he had been there, he would have given the orator in reply a recipe for an eye-wash. The received text puts the jest completely under eclipse. I can remember a similar mischievous perversion of 'It blows: it snows' into 'It blows its nose' in the midst of an artificial storm at a pantomime I saw as a child, and the amusement this gave one of the audience at least.

Clearly as it is the present policy of the state and the present, not the past, medical treatment for ophthalmia that is referred to, *χρή* not *ἐχρῆν* is needed.

The confusion of *δαί* and *δή* is not unknown and extends even to the MSS. of Homer.

420 *ἦν δ' ἀποκλείῃ τῇ θύρᾳ . . .*

To shut a man out with the door is a peculiar expression, not justified by *Wasps* 775 *τῇ κιγλίδι*. The door is always there: the *κιγλίς* is a temporary expedient. However this may be, neither *ἀποκλείῃ* (Faber) nor *ἀποκλήῃ* (Dindorf) nor *ἀποκλείσῃ* is in any MS. All authority is for *ἀποκλίνῃ*, and Par.[1] has the genitive which makes a satisfactory reading without any element of conjecture,

ἦν δ' ἀποκλίνῃ τῆς θύρας.

Cf. *Hymn. Aphr.* 168 :

ἦμος δ' ἂψ εἰς αὖλιν ἀποκλίνουσι νομῆες
βοῦς καὶ ἴφια μῆλα νομῶν ἐξ ἀνθεμοέντων.

462 *οὐδὲ στένειν τὸν ὄρθρον ἔτι πρᾶγμ' ἆρά μοι ;*

It is apparent from 460 that *ἄρα* not *ἆρα* is here required.

οὐδὲ στένειν τὸν ὄρθρον ἄρ' ἔτι πρᾶγμά μοι ;

Hermann has made what is virtually the same suggestion *ἔτ' ἄρα πρᾶγμά μοι*. *Ἄρ' ἔτι*, however, seems slightly the better of the two.

473 *λόγος γε τοί τις ἔστι τῶν γεραιτέρων.*

Probably Blepyrus did not introduce his little legend with such gravity. He puts it rather in the class of what we call old wives' tales. I would accordingly dispense with the somewhat unsuitable particles and read:

λόγος γελοῖος ἔστι τῶν γεραιτέρων,

'The old folks have a funny story.' Cf. *Wasps* 1259 *Αἰσωπικὸν γελοῖον* Id. 566 *Αἰσώπου τι γελοῖον.*

482 *μή πού τις ἐκ τοὔπισθεν ὢν τὸ σχῆμα καταφυλάξῃ.*

In place of the absurdly inadequate *καταφυλάξῃ*, which seems to be largely due to the *φύλαττε σαυτὴν ἀσφαλῶς* of the preceding line, I would read *κατακαχάξῃ*, a less familiar verb, not very remote from the tradition and infinitely more appropriate here, cf. 849 *καχάζων μεθ' ἑτέρου νεανίου*, Cicero, *de Fato* 5. 10 'in quo Alcibiades cachinnum dicitur sustulisse'; *Thesmoph.* 1089 *κακκάσκι = καγχάζει* (Bergler).

In 494 remove the comma at the end of the line. In fact, except for the sake of the emphasis given by the traditional order, the two lines (494-5) might be read quite unobjectionably:

μὴ καί τις ἡμᾶς ὄψεται
πώγωνας ἐξηρτημένας, χἠμῶν ἴσως κατείπῃ.

503 *χαῦται γὰρ ἤκουσιν πάλαι τὸ σχῆμα τοῦτ' ἔχουσαι.*

Professor A. Palmer suggested *ἀλγοῦσιν* for *ἤκουσιν*, making *αὗται* refer to the ladies' cheeks (*γνάθοιν* in 502). This is ingenious and probable, but *ἀλγοῦσιν* is not so satisfactory. I should prefer in the same sense,

χαῦται γὰρ ἀκοῦσαι πάλαι τὸ σχῆμα τοῦτ' ἔχουσι.

508 *χάλα συναπτοὺς ἡνίας Λακωνικάς.*

The plural *χαλᾶτε* is indispensable. The direction is not addressed to any single individual. The case is different in 509 *καὶ μέντοι σὺ μέν* where Praxagora appoints a substitute for herself. I suggest *χαλᾶτ' ἀνάπτους* which has apparently escaped the drum-fire of Blaydes.

514 Bentley's *κεῖται δ' ἤδη* for the defective *κεῖται δή* is distinctly better than Dobree's *κεῖται καὶ δή*, which should rather be *καὶ δὴ κεῖται.*

Bentley's correction is adopted by Rogers, who himself had the same idea.

556 *τί δρᾶν; ὑφαίνειν;* Βλ. *οὐ μὰ Δί' ἀλλ' ἄρχειν.* Πρ. *τίνων;*

There is no particular point in this, if *ὑφαίνειν* means simply 'to do weaving.' It seems to me that *πόλιν* (v. 555) is to be supplied as an object after *ὑφαίνειν* in one sense, and *πόλεως* after *ἄρχειν* in another, for *πόλις* is also the name of a game resembling chess. So *πόλιν ὑφαίνειν* would mean 'to weave or plan a gambit.' We might almost say 'to play *constitution*.'

626 *ἀλλὰ φυλάξουσ' οἱ φαυλότεροι τοὺς καλλίους ἀπιόντας*
ἀπὸ τοῦ δείπνου καὶ τηρήσουσ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν δημοσίοισιν
οἱ φαυλότεροι ·

The repetition of *οἱ φαυλότεροι* is a manifest error in the tradition. The usual device is to omit the words, and then patch up the line by some addition to the next sentence, *v.* Rogers *ad loc.* This leaves the appearance of *οἱ φαυλ.* unexplained. My suggestion involves no change in the punctuation and would read thus :

καὶ τηρήσουσ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν δημοσίοισιν
τοῖς τ' αὐλείοις ·

The meaning of this not being at once apparent, *οἱ φαυλότεροι*, of which it is slightly suggestive, may have been reached either immediately or through *οἵ τ' αὔλειοι* ; but in any case nothing can be more appropriate than the proposed words whatever the extent of their graphical probability, as may be seen from the explanation given by Suidas of *αὔλειος* : *ἡ ἀπὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ πρώτη θύρα τῆς οἰκίας*—'Αριστοφάνης Δαναΐσι. Αὔλειος and *αὔλειοι* are elsewhere used as fem. sc. *θύρα* or *πύλη* and *θύραι*, but here *τοῖς* instead of *ταῖς* may well be right after *ἐπὶ τοῖς δημοσίοισιν* (*τόποις* Schol.).

Those gentlemen who are less attractive personalities, says Praxagora, will lurk and lie in wait at the street corners and in doorways ; cf. *Peace* 981 *καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖναι παρακλίνασαι τῆς αὐλείας (-ου) παρακύπτουσιν.*

I agree with Rogers that in line 629 *σιμοῖς* is far more likely than *μικροῖς*. The *Λυσικράτους ῥίς* of 630, the laughable parody of Homer's *ἷς Τηλεμάχοιο*, shows this conclusively.

633 *ὅταν ἐμβάδ' ἔχων.*

Read *οὐμβάδ'*. The article seems quite necessary here.

643 *μὴ αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον τύπτῃ δεδιὼς τοῖς δρῶσιν τοῦτο μαχεῖται.*

Αὐτὸν ἐκείνον MSS. cannot mean what is evidently intended, viz. the father of the interposer. Accordingly Faber suggested *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ*, which has been challenged by high authorities, beginning with Bentley, on the ground that it could only mean the striker's father. There is, however, no such necessity and no real ambiguity here, any more than there is in this sentence of Xenophon, who did know something of the Greek language (*Anab.* VII. 1. 29), *ὅμως δὲ εἰσιέναι, ἔφη, ἐκέλευσεν, εἰ μέλλοι σὺν ἑαυτῷ ἐκπλεῖν.*

Accordingly either *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ* or *πατέρ' αὑτοῦ* or even *αὑτοῦ 'κεῖνος* would serve here.

In 649 *γεγόνει* ' was born ' is better than *γέγονεν* ' is born.'

663 *τῆς αἰκείας οἱ τύπτοντες πόθεν ἐκτίσουσιν, ἐπειδὰν*
εὐωχηθέντες ὑβρίζωσιν ;

Probably *οἱ φεύγοντες*, cf. *Ach.* 1129 *δειλίας φευξούμενον.* Bentley proposed *ληφθέντες* which makes good sense, but Dobree's *τὴν αἰκείας* is merely an

imaginative form of expression; *τῆς* is essential, but the genitive alone lacks supports *pace* L. and S. Lex.

772 *τί γὰρ ἄλλο γ' ἢ φέρειν παρεσκευασμένοι*
τὰ χρήματ' εἰσίν; ΑΝ. *ἀλλ' ἰδὼν ἐπειθόμην.*

The true reading is *ἂν ἐπειθόμην*, not *ἂν ἐπιθόμην* as Brunck suggested. In a proverbial expression the aorist without *ἄν* would be right, e.g. *Frogs* 51 *κᾆτ' ἔγωγ' ἐξηγρόμην*. Here the objector is simply stating his own case: 'I should be convinced now (imperfect with *ἄν*), if I had seen it.' The next two lines tell us plainly that he has not seen and does not expect to see any such thing:

Χρ. *λέγουσι γοῦν ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς.* ΑΝ. *λέξουσι γάρ.*
Χρ. *καί φασιν οἴσειν ἀράμενοι.* ΑΝ. *φήσουσι γάρ.*

The case of Chremes is, in fact, exceptional. In the next line, 775, the pronoun might advantageously be expressed, *ἀπολεῖς μ' ἀπιστῶν πάντ'*.

794 Χρ. *χαρίεντα γοῦν πάθοιμ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ 'χοιμ' ὅποι*
ταῦτα καταθείμην. Αν. *μὴ γὰρ οὐ λάβοις ὅποι·*
θάρρει, καταθήσεις, κἂν ἔνης ἔλθῃς.

So this passage stands in the MSS. Brunck's *καταθείην* is usually accepted for *καταθείμην*, but this does not help much. The real difficulty is in *μὴ γὰρ οὐ λάβοις ὅποι·* which is mere nonsense, not redeemed by reading *λάβῃς*, as many do after Heindorf. I shall not stay to examine the seven solutions offered by Blaydes or Palmer's *βάλοις*, in which he had so much alas! mistaken confidence. Read then without much departure from the tradition:

μὴ γὰρ εὐλαβοῖ' ὅποι·

The explanation is simple and can be given in a few words. Chremes says, 'I should be in a nice fix, in a queer strait or street, as we now say, if I knew not where to plank down these goods.' The mocking gentleman answers, 'Why, yes, you would be, if you don't be careful where . . .' At full length his reply would be, *χαρίεντα γὰρ πάθοις ἄν, εἰ μὴ εὐλαβοῖο, ὅποι ταῦτα καταθείης*. But people do not usually talk at full length. He says enough to be quite intelligible if *ε* had not been displaced by *ο* (*εὐ-* by *οὐ*) and a superfluous *ς* attached to *λάβοι'*, probably to save a supposed hiatus.

801 Χρ. *μαχούμεθ' αὐτοῖς.* Αν. *ἢν δὲ κρείττους ὦσι, τί;*
Χρ. *ἄπειμ' ἐάσας.* Αν. *ἢν δὲ πωλῶσ' αὐτά, τί;*

Ἄπειμ' ἐάσας is read by all editors except Bergk and Velsen, who give *ἄπει μ' ἐάσας* after Tyrwhitt, and this latter is undoubtedly the true reading. I hope to prove this, and thus render some service to the study of Aristophanes, for it is very evident that neither Tyrwhitt nor his followers have ever had the least comprehension of the jest here, which is of the same type as that already explained on 404 q.v. I hope also to justify *ἢν δὲ πωλῶσ' αὐτά,*

'which,' Rogers says, 'nobody has attempted to explain and which does not seem to admit any satisfactory explanation.'

Chremes has declared that his party, the great majority, as he thinks, will fight those who refuse to obey the law. He is met by the carping objection: 'But if they win the fight, what then?' Naturally he loses patience and replies: 'Be off; leave me alone' (*ἄπει μ' ἐάσας*).

The objector, however, proceeds to exasperate the poor fellow still further by pretending to think that he has answered: 'I will leave my chattels and go away' (*ἄπειμ' ἐάσας*), an answer that to some extent recalls Dogberry's famous charge to the Watch: 'But if he will not stand?' 'Why, then, take no note of him, but let him go.' The tormentor accordingly rejoins: 'But if they sell them, what then?' This upsets Chremes altogether, and he answers at least to all intent: 'Go and smother yourself' (*διαρραγείης*). Then to the imperturbable: 'If I do, what then?' comes the reply: 'You will do a good piece of work' (*καλῶς ποιήσεις*). And so at last poor Chremes 'gets a little of his own back,' as the saying is.

The rest of the line, however, *σὺ δ' ἐπιθυμήσεις φέρειν;* is not quite suitable to the occasion. There can be no question as to future desire or intention. The question must be, what is your present purpose? What do you intend now? Accordingly the true reading can hardly be other than

σὺ δ' ἐπιθυμεῖς εἰσφέρειν;

and probably, though not of necessity, *ὁρῶ 'σφέροντας* (806).

836 *ὅπως ἂν ὑμῖν ἡ τύχη κληρουμένοις*
φράσῃ καθ' ἕκαστον ἄνδρ' ὅποι δειπνήσετε·

The personification of Fortune is possible, but hardly suitable to a comedy and a Crier. I suggest *ᾗ τύχῃ*, 'that you may be allotted *as it may chance*, and the *στρατηγίς* (the lady commander) may tell you where each man will go for dinner.'

864 Αν. *καλούμεθ' αὐτάς.* Χρ. *ἢν δὲ καταγελῶσι, τί;*

A laugh could never be an adequate answer to a summons. I would read *ἢν δὲ καταγγείλωσι, τί;* 'But if they denounce, report you i.e. as a defaulter.' This would, of course, invalidate the summons; for what shadow of right to push his way into the public dining-hall could any man have who had not contributed his goods to the common stock?

Neither *κἀπελῶσι* (Bergk) nor *γ' ἀπελαύνωσι* (Blaydes) will serve here.

891 *φιλοττάριον αὐλητά, τοὺς αὐλοὺς λαβών.*

I suggest that *φιλοττάριον* is merely a mistake for *φιλοτητάριον*, a legitimate diminutive of *φιλότης*, cf. Plat. *Phaedrus* 228D *ὦ φιλότης=ὦ φίλε.*

912 *αἲ αἲ τί ποτε πείσομαι ;*

Read *παίσομαι*. She means nothing more than 'I have no playfellow,' as the next words show. 920 Read *λαβδᾶν*. 1104 Read *συνέλξομαι*.

1166 *καὶ σὺ κίνει.* Βλ. *τοῦτο δρῶ.* Χο. *καὶ τάσδε νυν . . .*
. . . λαγαρὰς τοῖν σκελίσκοιν τὸν ῥυθμόν.

These lines might be completed so as to read thus :

καὶ σὺ κίνει. Βλ. *τοῦτο δρῶ.* Χο. *καὶ τάσδε νυν τὰς μείρακας*
ἐλκύσαι τονδί γε λαγαρὰς τοῖν σκελίσκοιν τὸν ῥυθμόν.

Cf. *Clouds* 540 *οὐδὲ κόρδαχ' εἵλκυσεν.*

T. L. Agar.

PVNCTO TEMPORE (-RIS).

Can anyone throw light on this phrase of Lucretius ?

2, 263 patefactis tempore puncto | carceribus (see Munro's note) ;
4, 214 Iamne uides igitur quam puncto tempore imago
aetheris ex oris in terrarum accidat oras ?
6, 230 Et liquidum puncto facit aes in tempore et aurum.

The latest explanation (Sommer, *Erläuterungen*, p. 96) classes it with *occaso sole*, *ante solem occasum*, etc., of early writers, e.g. of Lucilius (who, by the way, has in line 472 'puncto uno horae quōque') :

68 quae horis sublata duabus
omnia sunt sole occaso.

This will never do. To Lucilius *sole occaso* has precisely the same construction as *sole orto*. The use in Early Latin of Deponent Participles of Intransitive Verbs (e.g. *tacitus* of *taceo*, *maestus* of *maereo*, *occasus* of *occĭdo*) has been discussed in *Class. Quart.* 7, 9.

If *puncto* be a Participle, it must be Passive (as Munro explains it). But can 'pierced time' mean 'minutely divided time'? Horace's *sectus orbis* is not quite a parallel.

The third explanation is suggested by Leo's theory of *-ĭs* having been written (and pronounced) *-ĕ* in Early Latin (and later), a theory which has many weak points. (Is it certain that *iure* in *iure consultus* is Genitive, not Ablative?) Lucretius had found, let us say, in Ennius the spelling *tempore* for *temporis*, and thought *punctum* (-ti, -to) *tempore* the archaic form of *punctum* (-ti, -to) *temporis*. The *quam* of 4, 214 might follow the analogy of *quam subito*.

Of course, when the *Latin Thesaurus* reaches the end of P we shall all know everything about the phrase, for that great work never (one may say, never) omits anything of real importance. But information is wanted now (for a book on Early Latin Verse).

W. M. Lindsay.

The University,
St. Andrews.

ON THREE PASSAGES OF THEOCRITVS.

XI. 50 sqq.

'Come, live with me,' says Polyphemus (l. 42), 'and leave the grey sea to beat upon the shore; my cave has all the heart could desire, laurels and cypresses, ivy and a sweet-fruited vine; a stream too fed by the snows of Etna.'

50 αἰ δέ τοι αὐτὸς ἐγὼν δοκέω λασιώτερος ἦμεν,
ἐντὶ δρυὸς ξύλα μοι καὶ ὑπὸ σποδῶ ἀκάματον πῦρ·
καιόμενος δ' ὑπὸ τεῦς καὶ τὰν ψυχὰν ἀνεχοίμαν
καὶ τὸν ἔν' ὀφθαλμόν, τῶ μοι γλυκερώτερον οὐδέν.

'There's wood in store, and on the floor a fire that smoulders still,' says Mr. Edmonds. 'In my cave oak billets lie,' Mr. Way, who adds that the line 'alludes to the primitive method of shaving by singeing.'[1]

But does it? and was singeing a method of shaving in Greece? I have heard of pigskins being singed, of women using fire as a depilatory[2] and Mnesilochus reluctantly imitating them when disguising himself as a woman,[3] of the Cyclops' eyebrow and lashes being singed when his eye was put out,[4] and finally of Dionysius arming his daughters with red hot nutshells because he mistrusted his barber,[5] but I cannot find other evidence that men were singed. And if they were, might not Polyphemus, if Galatea dislikes his hairiness, singe himself before her arrival? And, finally, is καίειν an appropriate word for singeing? I cannot find that it is.

What I look for in l. 51 is not a means of improving the Cyclops' looks (towards which, in any case, singeing would not go far), but a reason for tolerating them, and that as I think we have. Καίειν, though not appropriate to singeing, is commonly used of the fires of love, and when the Cyclops says he has store of oak-logs and beneath the ashes undying fire, he surely means that he has them in his heart; or, in other words, that the fires of love are stoked and kindled, and if Galatea will fan them to a blaze he does not care what they may consume, not even if it be his dearest member—to wit, his eye.

Love is, of course, commonly spoken of as a fire: ἔρως ἄρα καὶ Λιπαραίω] πολλάκις Ἀφαίστοιο σέλας φλογέρωτερον αἴθει, says Simaetha (II. 133); it is here so treated with grotesque literalness because Polyphemus is a grotesque creature, and a fire of oak-wood is the hottest thing he knows. The reference to his eye in 53 resumes the note of naïveté of which he is about to give us some further samples. 'Alas!' he continues, 'that I was not born with gills' (or is it 'fins'?); 'then I could have visited you and brought you snowdrops

[1] So Meineke; other commentators do not explain.
[2] Ar. *Eccl.* 13.
[3] Ar. *Thesm.* 216.
[4] *Od.* ix. 389.
[5] Cic. *Tusc.* v. 20. 58.

and poppies—not both at once though, for they do not flower at the same time. Even now I would have swimming lessons if I could get hold of an instructor.' The naïveté of 58 has been observed; so, I think, would that have been which I detect in 51 if it had occurred in the middle and not at the beginning of the other figures. It is the Cyclopean for such sayings as *θερμὸς ἔρως αὐτῶ με καταίθει*[1] or *me lentus Glycerae torret amor meae.*

While on the subject of love and the eleventh Idyll, perhaps I may add that love, besides being a fire, is also a wound,[2] but it is not, in Theocritus at any rate, a disease. And it is because Theocritus thinks of it as a wound that he mentions only remedies for external application, *ἔγχριστα* and *ἐπίπαστα φάρμακα*, in l. 2 of this poem. No doubt commentators know this, but they do not say so, and I mention it lest contemplation of Aesch. *P.V.* 496 should one day lead somebody into an imprudence.

XVII. 1 sqq.

ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα καὶ ἐς Δία λήγετε Μοῖσαι,
ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον ἐπὴν κλείωμεν ἀοιδαῖς·
ἀνδρῶν δ' αὖ Πτολεμαῖος ἐνὶ πρώτοισι λεγέσθω
καὶ πύματος καὶ μέσσος· ὃ γὰρ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν.

In poems, then, which deal with the best of the immortals Zeus is to be mentioned at the beginning and the end. Theocritus's piety, if this be so, does not, I must confess, seem to me excessive. For if Zeus is not himself the best of the immortals it would be more courteous to leave him out altogether, since if he is mentioned at all it can only provoke unfavourable comparison with his superior; and if we still give Zeus first place, and the poem is after all about him, then the injunction to mention him at the beginning and end of it seems, to say the least, superfluous. Moreover, whatever be the origin of the exhortation *ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα*, it is not in practice so circumscribed in its application. Aratus begins with Zeus a manual of astronomy, and Theocritus himself is better than his word, for the very poem we are discussing begins and ends with Zeus, and yet is entirely about Ptolemy.

After all, what Theocritus must have said is that poems in general should begin and end with Zeus—*a Ioue Musarum primordia*—and one at least of the scholiasts understood him to have done so: *πᾶν ποίημα ὅταν γράφωμεν, ὑμνοῦμεν τὸν Δία ἐν πρώτοις καὶ πυμάτοις καὶ μέσοις.* The scholiast goes beyond his instructions and adds *ἐν μέσοις*, because he is concerned to point the sequence of thought in the first two couplets, of which more in a moment; but at any rate he has no notion of the limiting clause in l. 2, and that clause must on all grounds be removed. It follows therefore that *ἀθανάτων τὸν ἄριστον* in l. 2 is in apposition to *Δία* (whereby incidentally it balances *ὃ γὰρ προφερέστατος ἀνδρῶν* as it never did before) and not the object of a new verb, and further that *κλείωμεν* is not what Theocritus wrote.

This last conclusion need not disturb us, for as a matter of fact the word

[1] VII. 56; cf. 102, III. 17. [2] XI. 15, XXX. 10.

which stands in most modern texts[1] is due to Schaefer: the MSS. have *ἀείδωμεν* or *ἄίδωμεν*. How to replace it is less certain. I had thought of *διαθῶμεν ἀοιδάς*, 'in the disposition of our poems,' but after all *ἀείδωμεν* is probably not a graphical error but an anticipation of the following word, and I should prefer the general formula *μεμνώμεθ' ἀοιδᾶς*.

It remains to say a word about the connexion of thought in the two couplets. 'Begin and end your poems with *Zeus*' is as a general precept unexceptionable, but a general injunction to speak of Ptolemy at the beginning and end of your poems and also in the middle is much less reasonable, and in fact only tolerable because this particular poem happens to be about Ptolemy. What Theocritus is concerned to say is that Ptolemy is among men what *Zeus* is among gods. He puts it in the form of two precepts, one seemingly proverbial but more honoured in the breach than in the observance,[2] the other new and in general impracticable. It is enough for his purpose that both are observed in the present poem; the logic is not flawless, but it will pass. That Theocritus did not mean (as on the vulgate appears) to limit the occasions for mentioning *Zeus* to poems about the best of the immortals, and by implication those for mentioning Ptolemy to poems about the best of men, is, I think, sufficiently proved by the fact that the former limitation is disregarded in this very poem.

XXII. 177 sqq.

The Dioscuri, carrying off the two daughters of Leucippus, are pursued and overtaken by the sons of Aphareus, Lynceus, and Idas, to whom the ladies are betrothed. The Dioscuri are deaf to the protests of Lynceus, and a conflict is imminent when Castor intervenes with the proposal that Idas and Pollux shall stand aside and leave the matter to be decided by a duel between himself and Lynceus, the younger pair:

ἄλις νέκυς ἐξ ἑνὸς οἴκου
εἷς· ἀτὰρ ὦλλοι πάντες ἐϋφρανέουσιν ἑταίρους
νυμφίοι ἀντὶ νεκρῶν, ὑμεναιώσουσι δὲ κούρας
τάσδ'· ὀλίγῳ τοι ἔοικε κακῷ μέγα νεῖκος ἀναιρεῖν.

The purpose of the duel, says Hiller, must be that the victor and his brother should wed the maidens. But since the brother of the vanquished will also survive, it is plain that *ὦλλοι πάντες* will not do, for there are only two prospective brides and there will be three bridegrooms. Nor is the matter bettered by reading *πάντας*, since *ὦλλοι* even by itself must mean *ὦλλοι πάντες*. Hartung therefore solved the difficulty by omitting the words from *ἀτάρ* to *τάσδ'*, but unsatisfactorily, since an excision involving parts of lines fails to carry conviction. Nor can the same result be obtained by omitting 178-180 in their entirety, for if both pairs fought, the dead might still be *ἐξ ἑνὸς οἴκου*, and 177 is not enough by itself to express the meaning.

[1] The older vulgate was *ᾄδωμεν*: *αὐδῶμεν* Cholmeley, *αἰδώμεθ'* Edmonds. All these are open to the same objection as *κλείωμεν*.

[2] It is unnecessary for this purpose to discuss the relation of Aratus to Theocritus since the sentiment does not seem to have originated with either. One scholiast ascribes it to Orpheus: cf. Hes. *Th.* 48, Theogn. 2.

Now I agree with Hiller that the purpose of the duel should be to decide which pair of brothers should have the maidens, but such terms are not quite simple, and surely need express statement which they nowhere receive. In view therefore of the difficulties of 177-180, I ask myself whether Theocritus may not have conceived it otherwise—whether in fact he did not mean that Idas and Pollux should wed the maidens, and think of both the others as killed in the duel. All turns on the meaning of *νέκυς ἐξ ἑνὸς οἴκου εἷς*. We have so far supposed it to imply one single corpse, just as at xxix. 12 *ποίησον καλιὰν μίαν ἐν ἑνὶ δενδρίῳ* means 'make one single nest'; the doubled numerals reinforce one another, but *ἑνός* and *ἑνί* respectively are really superfluous. There is however another possibility. Xenophon when he writes[1] *ὁ συνεθισθεὶς τὸν ἕνα ψωμὸν ἑνὶ ὄψῳ προπέμπειν*, does not mean 'the man who eats only one sauce,' but 'the man who observes the principle—one sop, one sauce': in other words, the doubled numerals do not here reinforce one another but are distributive, and *ἕνα* stands for *ἕνα ἕκαστον*.[2] So in our passage *ἑνός may* stand for *ἑνὸς ἑκατέρου*, and the phrase can mean 'one from each house'; and if it does, we may read *πάντας* and tolerate the remaining lines, for *ὦλλοι* will then be two in number and there will be brides to go round.

This view has, I now find, already been taken by Mr. Edmonds, who translates, 'one is enough dead of one household, and the two that shall be left shall glad all their friends as bridegrooms,' but since it obviously needs discussion I let my note stand. For my own part, I put the suggestion forward with all reserve, for it is open to the obvious objection that duels usually result in one death and not two, and that Castor in the event survives. Fortunately however Idas is disposed of by an act of Zeus, and the problem of matching three bridegrooms with two brides does not arise. It is not, I think, unreasonable to attribute the unsatisfactory conditions proposed by Castor for the duel (for unsatisfactory they are on this hypothesis) in part to Theocritus's foreknowledge of this impending catastrophe, but the fact is that Theocritus is more concerned with the quarrel than its antecedents. Castor acquits himself creditably in the fray, but the rape which leads to it does him less honour, and Theocritus makes no further allusion to the Leucippids, and does not even tell us that the Dioscuri married them. One allusion to marriage there is, and it lends some faint support to the view here proposed. Idas's death is announced in these terms (205 sq.): *οὐ μὰν οὐδὲ τὸν ἄλλον ἐφ' ἑστίῃ εἶδε πατρῴῃ | παίδων Λαοκόωσα φίλον γάμον ἐκτελέσαντα*. It is not of course conclusive; but if Castor meant what I suggest, Idas was at this point looking forward to a marriage, whereas, if he meant what Hiller supposed, Idas's marriage, at any rate with a Leucippid, was definitely off.

A. S. F. Gow.

[1] *Mem.* III. 14. 6.

[2] For this omission we may compare Pl. *Legg.* 758B *τὸ δωδέκατον μέρος αὐτῶν ἐπὶ δώδεκα μῆνας νείμαντας ἓν ἑφ' ἑνί*, with *Soph.* 229B *διπλῆ γὰρ αὕτη γιγνομένη, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ τὴν διδασκαλικὴν δύο ἀναγκάζει μόρια ἔχειν, ἓν ἑφ' ἑνὶ γένει τῶν αὐτῆς ἑκατέρῳ.*

THE ANALOGIST AND ANOMALIST CONTROVERSY.

THE controversy between the Anomalists and Analogists has not, I think, attracted as much of the attention of scholars as it deserves.[1] It was perhaps not a very practical matter, though, as I shall point out presently, it probably had indirectly some important practical results. The interest of the controversy lies rather in the spirit in which it was conducted. Anyone who reads for instance Varro, *De Ling. Lat.* VIII. 31-32, where the anomalist argues that as in life variety of furniture and the like is necessary for aesthetic enjoyment, so in language anomaly is desirable; or IX. 24, etc., where the analogist argues from the unchanging order that prevails in the heavenly bodies, in the tides, in the continuity of species, will feel that he is moving in a world of thought very different in one way from our own, though in another rather like it. By the analogist language is conceived as a world in itself, much as we conceive of the visible world. Its phenomena are being laid bare and constantly reveal fresh signs of law and order. The investigator sometimes finds facts which *prima facie* suggest anomaly, but he is as confident that behind them must lie some unifying principle as the scientific man of to-day is with regard to the phenomena of the visible world, as impatient of the suggestion of disorder as he is of any miraculous interference with the order of nature. Even the anomalist, sceptic as he is, approaches the question not in a spirit of mere denial, but of aesthetic consideration. We get a glimpse of a lost point of view. The world of words had a glamour and a wonder for them which it cannot have for us.

When Greek philosophy first turned to the subject of language, the earliest distinction it set up was between *τὸ σημαινόμενον* and *τὸ σήμαινον*, the thing meant and the actual word spoken. When it made the former the primary object of study it produced the theory of the parts of speech, and its final results in this department, and indeed the terminology itself, have come down to us practically unchanged. When it made the latter its primary object it produced 'etymology,' of which unfortunately the same cannot be said.

A little further consideration of words however led to the conclusion that their relationship varied greatly. Some words were obviously very closely related, so much so that they could only be regarded as flexions or *κλίσεις* of each other. In other cases, though a relationship might be suspected, it could

[1] Much of this paper covers the same ground as parts of Steinthal's *Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen und Römern*. The greater part both of the facts and of the inferences has, I think, been arrived at independently.

not be affirmed with equal certainty, while in others no relationship was discernible. Thus a distinction arises between the word itself (which in nouns was naturally identified with the nominative singular; in verbs, with less reason, with the first person singular present), and its κλίσεις. It is to the science of the former that the term ἐτυμολογία becomes restricted. The science of the latter never really acquires a name, but has to content itself with employing a term which arose in a different quarter—analogy.

Whilst philosophical thought was concerning itself with the nature of language, the grammarians were busying themselves with the correction of texts, and particularly Homer, who, it must always be remembered, was to them to some extent a writer in a dead language. In determining doubtful points, the principle of 'proportion' or 'analogy' was one of the leading tests. If the genitive plural of θώς was according to some θώων, according to others θωῶν, while the genitive of θήρ was undoubtedly θηρῶν, it was reasonable to argue that θωῶν : θηρῶν :: θώς : θήρ.[1] I see no reason to doubt that this process was applied from very early days of grammatical investigation, or (in spite of Steinthal) that Aristophanes himself attempted to formulate the conditions under which analogy could be guaranteed. Analogy then is properly the name for the principle which was used in the science of κλίσις rather than for the science itself.[2] But it comes to be used for the science itself. Thus in Dionysius Thrax and Varro, we find it regularly as the counterpart of ἐτυμολογία.

Both of these sciences had their opponents as well as their defenders. Varro devoted three books (now lost) to 'quae contra etymologiam dicerentur, quae pro ea, quae de ea,' in just the same way as he treated analogy. But naturally the controversy on analogy, which claimed an order and method, which etymology could not claim, was far warmer. In this controversy, I imagine, the tendency of the grammarians as a whole was to analogism. The scientific spirit, as I have said, was naturally impatient of disorder. The opposition seems to have come, to some extent at least, from Stoicism. The leading anomalist, Crates, at any rate was a Stoic, and he founded his views, even if by misapprehension[3] as Varro says, on Chrysippus' treatise περὶ ἀνωμαλίας. It is at first sight puzzling to find the Stoics on the side of anomaly. We know that they held that language was φύσει and that words corresponded to their meaning, and we hardly expect to find them on the side of disorder in κλίσις. Perhaps however the reason is not far to seek. If we examine the passage in (pseudo- ?) Augustine, *De dialectica*,[4] which seems to be our chief authority on the subject, it does not appear that the Stoics held that words, *as they actually existed*, were φύσει. In the first place, logical or illogical processes have deflected words from their natural meaning: 'Vis'

[1] So Aristarchus, quoted by Herodian, on *Il.* XIII. 103; *v.* Lehr's *Aristarchus*, p. 261.

[2] Cf. Pindarion apud Sext. Emp. *adu. Gramm.* 10. 202: ἀναλογία . . . ἐστὶν ὁμοίου τε καὶ ἀνομοίου θεωρία.

[3] *de L. L.* IX. 1.

[4] This passage is perhaps most accessible in Goetz and Wilmann's edd. of Varro; whether there are adequate grounds for the implied view that the writer draws from Varro I do not know.

is a natural word, for the letter 'u' has a forcible sound. Thence we get 'uinculum,' because chains use force (*per efficientiam*), and hence 'uitis' and 'uia' (*per similitudinem*), because vines and roads are apt to wind. At this point Augustine has had enough of it, and concludes 'quot modis autem origo uerborum corruptione uocum uarietur, ineptum est persequi.' I understand this *corruptio uocum* to refer to the other questions which the Stoic must have had to answer. Granted that 'uis' is *φύσει*, that 'uinculum' follows *per efficientiam* and 'uitis' *per similitudinem*, it must still be asked, whence comes the rest of the word 'uinculum'? The Stoic presumably fell back upon the 'demptio, additio, traiectio, commutatio' of letters and syllables of which Varro speaks.[1] In fact, though words may be to the Stoic of nature, it is nature corrupted. And this view is, I think, supported by the word 'etymology,' a rather curious term when one comes to think of it. It does not of course mean 'the truth about words,' but 'the science of *ἔτυμα*.' The doctrine that behind words, as we have them, lie roots which are true things, implies that as we find them they are not true. If this is the Stoic view, it is not surprising that Chrysippus and Crates, having found disorder in language up to the stage of *κλίσις*, should not be inclined to recognize immutable order in *κλίσις* itself.

The strength of the anomalist attack fell most powerfully on what we may call the outworks of *κλίσις*. The earliest conception of *κλίσις* does not distinguish between inflexions and what we (perhaps unconsciously following a line of thought laid down by analogistic grammarians) should call derivatives. In Varro 'Roma'[2] is a *declinatum* of 'Romulus,' 'ouile' of 'ouis,' while 'equitatum ab equitibus, equites ab equite, equitem ab equo,'[3] is spoken of as a homogeneous series. The anomalist laid stress on the great variation we find in such formations. We say 'ouile,'[4] but not 'bouile'; 'uinaria,' but not 'carnaria'; 'Romanus,' but 'Parmensis'; 'cantito,' but not 'amito'; 'aucupem,' but not 'piscicupem.' It is obvious that all this sphere of language does not lend itself to systematizing either in Greek or Latin, and the analogist's answer was to surrender the whole province. 'No one guarantees that a word in the nominative singular should be declined into another word in the nominative singular on the principle of analogy.'[5] Varro himself rests this on a general principle. We must distinguish between *declinatio uoluntaria* and *declinatio naturalis*. The former rests upon the caprice of men and exhibits inconsistency; to it belong such formations as 'Roma' from 'Romulus,' and 'Tiburs' from 'Tibur.' On the other hand, 'Romulus'—'Romulum'—'Romuli' is *declinatio naturalis*. Varro does not definitely say that 'ouile,' 'uinaria,' and the like are *declinationes uoluntariae*, but I think it is implied.

With this element eliminated, the field was restricted to *κλίσις* proper. Here one of the main points of attack was defectiveness. The anomalist pointed out that some nouns had no plural and others no singular, that 'bonus' had no comparative and 'melior' no positive. Again, they drew

[1] *De Ling. Lat.* V. 6.
[2] *Ib.* VIII. 18.
[3] *Ib.* VII. 4.
[4] *Ib.* VIII. 54-62.
[5] *Ib.* IX. 50.

attention to 'Iupiter'—'Iouis,' and the like. The answer of Varro's analogist is that the first class of defectiveness arises either from nature or from use. If a plural cannot be conceived of as in 'gold,' the word cannot exist;[1] if an animal plays so little part in human life that its sex does not concern us, we cannot expect both masculine and feminine forms. We used to call all pigeons 'columbae,' says Varro or his analogist authority, but now that the keeping of pigeons has become common, 'columbus' has come into use also.[2]

With regard to 'Iupiter'—'Iouis,' etc., the answer given is that such cases resemble the statue which has lost its head, or had an alien head fitted to it. Put Philip's head on Alexander's statue and the proportions of the rest of the statue are not affected.[3] With regard to a somewhat different point, Latin masculine nouns in *-ă*, the analogist declared that this difference of meaning did not affect the analogy. They were really still feminine nouns. A man may sometimes wear a woman's shoe, but it remains a woman's shoe for all that.[4]

But the main controversy gathered round nouns of similar nominatives but different declension. The opponents of Aristarchus had cited Φιλομήδης and Ἡρακλείδης; Aristarchus answered that the vocative must be taken into account as well as the nominative before the words could be postulated as similar, and therefore to be declined analogically. The anomalists replied that a contention of this kind made nonsense of the whole controversy. You lay down that, given similar parents, the offspring is similar. You find similar parents, observe the offspring, and find them dissimilar, and then infer that the parents are really dissimilar.[5] The analogist replies that it is rather the case of two appearing alike in a poor light. You bring in a candle and find that they are really unlike. He illustrates it by the nouns in *-x*, as 'crux' and 'Phryx.' They appear to have the same final letter, but 'crucis,' 'Phrygis' show the real difference.[6] Or again it is like the case of Gallic and Apulian wool. To the unexpert they seem the same, but the expert knows that the Apulian is the stronger, and pays a higher price for it, and so too the real similarity of words must be tested by their effect.[7] The same may be said of verbs: 'dolo' and 'colo' seem the same, but go on to 'dolas' and 'colis' and the difference becomes clear.[8]

This principle of Aristarchus,[9] which regards the noun as a whole, and does not start from any particular case, is of course the only sound basis for a theory of analogy. But it did not satisfy the grammarians as a whole. They were too closely wedded to the idea that the nominative of the noun was its 'prima positio,' the real noun from which the cases were merely 'fallings

1 *L.L.* IX. 66.
2 *Ib.* IX. 56.
3 *Ib.* IX. 79.
4 *Ib.* IX. 40.
5 *Ib.* VIII. 68, 69.
6 *Ib.* IX. 43, 44.
7 *Ib.* IX. 39.
8 *Ib.* IX. 108. The controversy seems to have dealt with the noun a great deal more than with the verb. The analogists seem to have argued that formations from the present stem belonged to a different word than formations from the perfect stem. If 'lego,' 'legam,' 'legebam,' follow analogically, and also 'legi,' 'legero,' 'legeram,' we have no right to expect analogy between 'lego' and 'legi.' If this were once granted, the regularity of the verb in Latin at any rate is very constant, and I suppose offered less target for the anomalists.
9 But perhaps Aristarchus himself was under the spell of the nominative, and chose the vocative as being merely a variation of the nominative.

away.' They accordingly rather took the line of showing that where there were differences of inflection there were also real differences in the nominative.

The simple and general rule for the comparison of any two words was, as Varro gives it,[1] that unless the 'casus, genus, species, exitus,' were the same, they could not be expected to correspond. In this formula *casus* apparently includes number, *genus* is of course gender, *species* means part of speech (adjectives not being distinguished from substantives, but on the other hand the *nomen* or *ὄνομα κύριον* being distinguished from the *uocabulum* or *προσηγορία*). *Exitus* is of course 'ending,' but it was clear that if this was restricted to the 'litterae quae commouentur,' the rule was useless to the analogist in his controversy with the anomalist, who could point out hundreds of instances where these conditions were satisfied and yet analogy did not result. Varro is therefore obliged to add that not only the 'litterae quae commouentur,' but the adjoining letters must be taken into consideration, for 'haec uicinitas aliquantum potest.'[2] This vague suggestion had naturally to be defined more closely. Some grammarians (perhaps only Latin) laid down the rule that the letter before the *exitus*, and therefore the whole of the last syllable, must be the same. This too was probably found inadequate. A rule quoted by Charisius, as originated by Aristophanes and supplemented by Aristarchus, adds to the above—(1) number of syllables, (2) accent, (3) that the words compared must be both compound or both simple.[3] But by far the fullest and clearest rule is found in the following passage, which is attributed to the grammarian Herodian: *Τὸ ὅμοιον ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἢ γένει ἢ εἴδει ἢ σχήματι ἢ ἀρίθμῳ ἢ τόνῳ ἢ πτώσει, ἢ καταλήξει ἐν παρατελεύτῳ συλλαβῇ·*[4] *ἐν χρόνῳ, ἐν ποσότητι συλλαβῆς, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ἐν ἐπιπλοκῇ συλλαβῶν· εἰ δὲ παρὰ ταῦτά τι γένοιτο ἀνόμοιος ἡ κλίσις γίγνεται.* The grammarian goes on to take various pairs of words of different declension and to show that they fail in one or other of these respects. *Τοξότης* and *φιλότης* are different in gender. *Ὀλυμπιονίκης* and *Πολυνίκης* are of different *εἶδος*, for one is a *προσηγορία*, the other an *ὄνομα κύριον*. *Ἱππότης* and *Σωκράτης* are different in *σχῆμα*. One is simple, the other compound. *Ἰχθῦς ἰχθύος* and *ἰχθῦς ἰχθύων* are different numbers. *Ἥρως* and *εὐρώς* have different accents. *Τοξότης* and *ἐλάτης* are different cases. *Καλός* and *βραδύς* have a different ending. *Πέρσης* and *Λάχης* are of different length in the penultimate, *Ἀρκάς* and *ἱμάς* in the final vowel. *Λυσίας* and *βίας* have a different number of syllables. *Σωλήν* and *ὑμήν* have a different consonant in the last syllable, for *μ* often turns *η* to *ε*.[5] This last case is put

[1] *L.L.* X. 21.

[2] *Ib.* X. 26.

[3] *Gram. Lat.* (K) I. 127. I do not think the vagueness of Varro's rule, as compared with that of Charisius, is conclusive that the latter is not as old as Aristophanes. Varro may well have seen that accent at any rate did not fit Latin, and hesitated at putting out a definite Latin rule.

[4] I print the extract as given in Cram, *Anec. Ox.* IV. 333, 6. But the colon after *συλλαβῇ* is clearly a mistake, as also the absence of comma after *καταλήξει*. The *καταλήξις* is the *exitus*. The *παραλήγουσα συλλαβή* is the penultimate. The series of *ἤ* gives the main considerations, the series of *ἐν* subordinate ones.

[5] The phrase *ἐπιπλοκὴ συμφώνου* means, I suppose, the tendency of the consonant to influence the following vowel.

forward somewhat tentatively, as a thing which does not happen regularly but often. If you cannot find any other difference in two nouns which are differently declined, you may fall back upon these consonants as the last resort.

The anomalists probably did not accept this law of *uicinitas*, whether in its later or its earlier form. But no doubt they preferred to meet the analogists on their own ground and beat them there if possible. Their trump card (in Latin) was 'lepus' and 'lupus.' 'Lepus' is of course an anomaly, being the only masculine noun in *-us* belonging to the third declension, but the anomalists strengthened their case by pitting it against 'lupus.' Here they said every possible demand of *uicinitas* is satisfied. The two words are identical except in their first vowels, and even these vowels are both short. The analogist was fain to reply that the two really differed in gender, for 'lepus' is epicene, having no feminine.[1] So again the anomalist put forward 'aper' and 'pater.' Here too it was undeniable that there was no difference of *uicinitas*. The other side replied by extending the idea of *species*. Grammarians in classifying nouns had distinguished between 'relative' and 'absolute' or 'positive' nouns. Since a father implies a child, 'pater' is a relative noun. Not so 'aper,' and hence the difference of declension does not contradict analogy.[2]

These analogist apologetics are of course very futile and even pitiful. If we take the tests of the alleged Herodian, gender, number, case and ending are obviously right. Perhaps too accent and even *σχῆμα* as bearing on accent have some sense. But the other tests, such as number of syllables or the length of the penultimate syllable, have no relation to reality so far as I can see. They served to baffle the anomalist because, whenever he pointed out a difference in the declension of two words of similar termination, it was generally possible to find one of these accidental differences. But at the same time they really obscured the true laws of analogy. When the grammarian says *εἰ δὲ παρὰ ταῦτά τι γένοιτο, ἀνόμοιος ἡ κλίσις γίγνεται*, he destroys his whole case, and indeed talks such obvious nonsense that I can hardly believe that he really represents the views of Herodian.

Still on the whole it seems to me that the analogists were right. They were right, that is, in maintaining that order reigns in *κλίσις*. We know as a matter of fact that a knowledge of comparatively few rules and examples will enable the student of Greek and Latin to decline correctly a very large number of words. When the analogist justified his position by the order of the heavenly bodies he went too far. But the passage at the end of Book IX., where Varro's analogist remarks that declensions differ from each other as the species of animals differ, but that the similarities within the classes are far greater and more striking than the dissimilarities of the classes, and that the

[1] Quint. I. 6, 12.

[2] Quint. I. 6, 13. This example brings us a good way on to the idea that analogy depended on the meaning of words. In general the analogist repudiated this doctrine (*L.L.* IX. 40), but we find traces of some such notion. Probably at any rate anomalists felt their case to be stronger if they could allege similarity of meaning. The force of *lepus*) (*lupus* was, I suspect, increased by the fact that they are both wild animals. In *L.L.* VIII. 10 we have associated with 'lepus' and 'lupus' the odd word 'surus.' This has been amended to 's(ci)urus,' but I should suggest 'ursus.'

occasional exception stands on a par with the freak or deformity, the 'equus claudicans' or 'homo luscus,' he makes a just comparison. As he says, you may apply the term 'anomaly' to the variations in nature, yet no one denies that order reigns in the animal and vegetable world, and so it is in the realm of *κλίσις*.

There is another point of view which ought to be noticed. This is the view that analogy itself, so far from being the opponent of 'usage,' itself springs from usage. It appears in the opening chapters of Book VIII., in a part of the work where Varro certainly seems to be giving his own opinion, though it is not easy to reconcile it with his oft-repeated statement that analogy is of nature.[1] But it is more fully developed by Quintilian,[2] who says that analogy was not something heaven-sent which dictated the form of speech, but is what we find that men actually do speak. It therefore rests on *exemplum*, not on *ratio*, and is actually created by usage. This view is in the main, I suppose, anomalistic. It abandons the idea that analogy must or even ought to control *consuetudo*. It is not, as Quintilian says, a *lex* which must be obeyed, but an *obseruatio*. Still it is so far analogistic that it does not deny that analogy is the dominant factor in *κλίσις*, and where *consuetudo* is doubtful it admits the presumption that analogical forms are to be preferred. For practical purposes—so far as practical purposes were involved at all—those who held it might well be analogists in tendency.

This brings us to the question, what were the practical results of the controversy? It has been remarked by others that one result was the formation of the canons or rules of declension. At any rate the controversy was a contributory cause to the work. When we try to realize the position in which a grammarian of the second or third century B.C. found himself, we may doubt whether such an herculean task as the reduction of *κλίσις* to a system would ever have been carried out without some such initial motive. It requires perhaps more philosophy to distinguish the parts of speech, but it requires little labour. But the analogist to maintain his position had to survey the whole of the language, otherwise, when he had met the anomalist successfully on one point, he might always be confronted with some overlooked exception. To survey the whole body of the nouns and verbs of the Greek and Latin languages, with no dictionaries or grammars, even of other languages, to serve as a guide or basis, seems to me a gigantic business. Yet, I take it, it was done in such a way that, until the birth of comparative philology, research found little to add to it.

On the other hand, it does not seem likely that analogical theory was

[1] 'Sed ii qui in loquendo partim sequi iubent nos consuetudinem partim rationem, non tam discrepant, quod consuetudo et analogia coniunctiores sunt inter se quam iei credunt, quod est nata ex quadam consuetudine analogia.' The words 'ii—credunt' are taken by Steinthal and Sir John Sandys to indicate a third party, of which they justly say that 'till *partim* is defined, it carries us no farther.' I take the words rather, 'these disputants (anomalists and analogists), who some of them bid us follow reason, while the others bid us follow usage, are not so far apart as they think.'

[2] I. 6. 16.

productive of much change in the spoken language. As the analogists stoutly maintained that language as it stood was analogical, as they attempted to justify most apparent exceptions and admitted nothing in the end but the 'lame horse' and the 'one-eyed man,' there could be no widespread return to analogy, simply because there had been so little departure from it.

With regard to the admitted exceptions, we find in certain chapters of Book IX. chapters[1] in which Varro is clearly stating the opinion of other analogists rather than his own—the suggestion that where analogy has been lost it ought to be restored. It is admitted that this will result in novelty, but it is argued at some length, from the examples of artists, generals, and others, that novelty has often to be faced in behalf of what is right. How far there were actually grammarians who carried out this principle on any considerable scale, who spoke themselves and tried to make their pupils speak on strict analogical principles, is a point on which I should be glad of enlightenment.[2] Sextus certainly writes as if there were people of this kind, who said *Ζέυς—Ζέος—Ζέι* and *κύων—κύωνος—κύωνι*.[3] So too Quintilian quotes as a happy remark about the analogists 'aliud esse Latine loqui, aliud grammatice.'[4] But both these are rather vague, and such remarks need not be more than anomalist taunts. It was a fair weapon against the analogists to assume that they would carry out their principles, and to point out the absurdities they would land themselves in. Failing better evidence, I should suppose that the accepted view is given by Varro himself, though he puts it in a curious way. The people, he says, ought to follow analogy, but individuals are on a different footing, for they are in the power of the people. The poet indeed may defy custom with impunity, but the orator and other individuals cannot. So till the people come to a better mind, the orator must submit to *consuetudo*.[5] This melancholy acquiescence in the less desirable reminds one of the attitude of our *Book of Common Prayer* in the Commination Service towards Open Penance. But it represents, I take it, the general attitude. Analogy is right in the abstract—even Quintilian, anomalist as he is at heart, admits this.[6] But 'until the said discipline may be restored again, which is much to be wished,' we must submit to usage. The exception is a heretic, but the Church is not in a position to persecute.[7]

[1] IV.-IX.

[2] The most definite instance I know of is the case of Sisenna, who used 'adsentio' for 'adsentior' in the senate, and was followed by others (Gellius, *N.A.* II. 25, and Quint. I. 5, 13, from Varro). This is not a very flagrant defiance of usage. Sir John Sandys (*Hist. of Class. Schol.* I., p. 142) says of Trypho 'that the titles of several of his books show that he was a strict adherent of analogy.' But analogy is often a mere name for declension (*v.* p. 25), and to write on it does not show the views of the writer. Nor do the fragments, as given by Velsen, show much analogistic tendency. He certainly postulated *δορ* and *δουρ* as nominatives for *δορὸς—δουρὸς*, and remarked that the plural and singular of *ἔγχελυς* were differently declined, but is not recorded as saying anything that savours of the views mentioned by Sextus. Caesar, who wrote 'de analogia,' and should on the same principle be a 'strict adherent of analogy,' evidently argued against some analogist views (Gell. *N.A.* I. 10, and XIX. 8).

[3] *Adu. Gram.* X. 195. [4] I. 6, 27.

[5] *L.L.* IX. 5, 6.

[6] I. 6, 21: 'Recta est haec uia. quis negat? sed adiacet et mollior et magis trita.'

[7] Cf. 'Consuetudo non ratione analogiae sed uiribus par . . . multorum consensione conualuit, ita tamen ut illi artis ratio non accedat sed indulgeat,' *Gramm. Lat.* (K.) I. 50.

There was however a sphere where the analogist could move with greater freedom. This is what Pliny calls *dubius sermo*, cases where usage itself oscillated more or less between the analogous and the anomalous form. Sextus tells us that the grammarians lay down the rule that simple nouns in *-ης* oxytone, as *εὐσεβής* and *εὐφυής*, make their genitive in *-ους*, not *-ου*, and that therefore the genitive of *εὐμενής* is *εὐμενοῦς*, not *εὐμενοῦ*.[1] As there is no authority for *εὐμενοῦ* the adjective, presumably he refers to the proper name *Εὐμενής*, which does exhibit these variations. So too Quintilian says that the analogists supported 'domu,' 'domuum,' against 'domo,' 'domorum,' apparently on the grounds that 'domus' as a fourth declension feminine noun found its analogy in 'anus,' 'manus.'[2] Steinthal may be right in saying that by the end of the first century A.D. the controversy had died down. The main controversy did die down, because two points were gradually established—one, that analogy prevailed in inflexion; the other that, where custom was thoroughly established, the analogist must acquiesce. But transferred to the arena of *dubius sermo* the contest continued, and the only thing that could bring it to an end was the decay of grammar as a living study. The questions debated and the mental attitudes displayed were the same in nature as those which we sometimes meet ourselves when such points are raised, as whether 'none are,' 'it is me,' are really 'bad grammar,' and therefore to be avoided. The difference lies in this—that whereas such points are to us little more than amusing trifles,[3] to the ancient mind they were questions of real and substantial interest. Whether however even here analogist theory had much influence on usage may be doubted. It would be possible, I suppose, to see how far anomalous forms in the older language tend to give way to analogous forms. But even if it proved to be so, it would not be much evidence. Analogy, philologists tell us, is a popular instinct, which is always reshaping language, and changes in this direction are quite as likely to be genuine *consuetudo* as the result of conscious grammatical effort.

The description of the opponents varies occasionally. Quintilian[4] couples with analogy etymology, as being also a 'rational' process, in which we reason from one word to another. Etymology will sometimes justify a form which might otherwise be thought barbarous, as 'Triquedra' for 'Triquetra,' or 'medidiem' for 'meridiem.' On the other hand, *consuetudo* is frequently associated with *auctoritas*. An anomalous form may be justified on the ground that it has good literary authority, quite as much as by common usage. Quintilian distinguishes between *auctoritas* and *uetustas*. A variation of the

[1] *Adu. Gramm.* X. 222. I do not understand the word *ἁπλᾶ*. All these words are surely compound, and Sextus could hardly fail to see it. It may be objected to my assumption that he refers to the name *Εὐμενής* that the analogists would have said that analogy could not be expected between the *uocabulum εὐμενής* and the *nomen Εὐμενής*. But it does not follow from the evidence that either (1) they all accepted this distinction, or (2) that they held it valid in the case of two identical words.

[2] I. 6, 4.

[3] I myself, by using the phrase 'none of your correspondents have,' became the subject of quite an animated controversy in a local newspaper.

[4] I. 6, 1.

formula, which appears in Diomedes and Charisius,[1] adds *natura*.[2] Nature, we are told, gives us the word as it stands; it determines that it shall be 'scribo,' not 'scrimbo,' then *analogia*, *auctoritas*, *consuetudo* inflect and vary it in different ways. Diomedes ascribes this formula to Varro, but though neither Goetz nor Willmanns nor Usener seem to find any difficulty, it seems to me almost impossible. Varro, as I have said, throughout maintains that the word in itself is *impositum*, and depends upon the *uoluntas hominum*, while nature, which he conceives of as order, is identified with analogy. It may be in a sense Stoical, but if I am right in what I said above it is a rather perverted Stoicism. For Stoic theory held that, while something which was nature lay at the back of 'scribo,' various processes of corruption had intervened. But, however derived, it is intelligible enough, and in the main it agrees with the other forms of the formula. For though nature has provided the raw material, it is still the case that analogy, and usage joined to authority, are the two conflicting forces which work it into shape. A more substantial addition to the formula is suggested by some of the later grammarians, as Consentius and Cledonius, when they say that *analogia* has sometimes to give way to *euphonia* or *suauitas*.[3]

Another word which played a part apparently in the controversy is καθολικός. In discussing this word we have, I think, to distinguish between two somewhat different meanings. Sometimes it means 'general' as opposed to 'particular' (μερικός). It does not imply that anything is universally true,

[1] *Gram. Lat.* (K) I. 50 and 439. Cf. Quint. I. 5: 'Simplices uoces prima positione, id est natura sua, constant,' though there the *prima positio* is not the nominative or first person present, but the uncompounded noun, as opposed to the compound.

[2] Usener in *Kleine Schriften* II. p. 297, moved, I think, by an unfortunate German propensity to find in competent writers an unintelligent and servile use of earlier authorities, supposes that in the formula 'natura, analogia, consuetudo, auctoritas,' both *etymologia* and *uetustas* might be interchanged with *natura*. Quintilian adopted *uetustas* from Palaemon, but knowing *etymologia* from other lists inserted that too! Now I do not think any such theory is necessary, for though Quintilian's distinction between *uetustas* and *auctoritas* may be a little over-fine, it is quite intelligible. To defend an archaic word on the ground that it was in the past in good use is distinguishable from defending it because it is used by some accepted author. But even if we agree with Usener that the distinction is absurd, I cannot accept his theory as it stands. For while it is possible, I think, that 'etymology' (used loosely for the processes into which etymology enquires) may have been a synonym for *natura*, and that Quintilian adopted it while giving the meaning a very different turn, I cannot understand (nor does Usener give, to my mind, an adequate explanation) how *uetustas* can have been so used. There is a modification, however, of the theory which I think is possible. This would be to regard *uetustas* as the opponent of *natura*, just as *consuetudo* is the opponent of *analogia*. This would find some support from Varro, who says 'neque omnis impositio uerborum exstat quod uetustas quasdam deleuit,' and later 'uetustas pauca non deprauat, multa tollit.' On this view the formula ran 'natura (or *etymologia*), uetustas, analogia, consuetudo, auctoritas,' and the meaning is that the true words, or ἔτυμα, are given us by nature, then modified by time (*uetustas*) till we get the *prima positio* of the noun or verb, the 'scribo' of Diomedes. This *prima positio* is inflected by analogy, which again is modified by usage and literary authority. I certainly think it is worth considering whether Quintilian did not find this formula, and either misunderstood it or deliberately gave it a new meaning, though the acceptance of this view would probably entail the abandonment of the theory of Quint. I. 6, which I put forward in *Class. Quart.*, January, 1914. When I wrote that paper I had not read Usener's article.

[3] This view, however, may be as old as Varro. Cf. *Gramm. Lat.* (K) I. 141: 'consuetudini et suauitati aurium censet summam uim esse tribuendam.' The subject of 'censet' is, I think, clearly 'Varro,' and not, as Steinthal and Sandys, 'Plinius.'

but only that so far as it is true it applies to the whole, and not merely to the parts. At other times it means 'universal' or 'without exception,' and is opposed to *τὸ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ*. It is used in both senses by the grammarians. When Herodian's work on accents is called *περὶ καθολικῆς προσωδίας*, it means I suppose 'accents as a whole,' but when, as frequently in the Latin grammarians, it means a 'rule,' it bears, at any rate in the mouths of analogists, the other sense. Sextus brings it definitely into connexion with the analogist controversy.[1] The grammarians, he says, allege certain *καθολικὰ θεωρήματα*, by which they judge individual words. He illustrates by the case of *εὐμενής* mentioned above. The champion of *Εὐμενοῦ*, he continues, will perhaps reply by denying the 'catholicity,' while others maintain that 'catholic' merely means *τὸ ἐκ πλειόνων*. This however is ridiculous, for *καθολικόν* is clearly different from *τὸ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ*. The former never deceives us, the latter does so, though rarely. The natural inference from this is that the 'catholicon' was in the eyes of the analogist a universal rule which admitted or ought to admit of no exceptions, while those whose tendencies were anomalistic whittled the term down to a general principle. I think we find an allusion to the first view in a passage of Quintilian (II. 13, 14), where he says: 'semper mihi moris fuit quam minime me alligare ad praecepta, quae *καθολικά* uocitant, id est ut dicamus quomodo possumus, uniuersalia uel perpetualia.' Quintilian is not indeed speaking of grammar, but of taste and suitableness in oratory, but he does not get the term from rhetoric, nor, so far as I know, from any other art or science. It was in grammar that he was familiar with (and rejected) laws which claimed 'universality' and 'perpetualness.' I do not know whether it is fanciful, but it seems to me that Quintilian sees in the word, as some used it, a certain passion and insistence. Note the frequentative 'uocitant,' which I do not think he uses elsewhere, and the 'quomodo possumus.' The word was to him hardly translatable. It had in fact acquired that force which acute controversy gives to a word, making any translation, even one so strong as Quintilian's doublet, seem cold in comparison with the original.

The question naturally occurs—did this analogistic use of *καθολικόν* help to shape the meaning of a watchword second to none in its influence on the history of Christendom and Europe? The term 'Catholic Church,' as Lightfoot notes,[2] goes through a certain transformation of meaning in the second century. It begins with meaning the Church as a whole, as opposed to the local churches, and the term, though Lightfoot does not note this, was almost a necessity, because in this particular case the name of the whole was the same as that of the parts. Regiments do not make a regiment, but an army. Limbs do not make a limb, but a body. It is only *ἐκκλησίαι* which make an *ἐκκλησία*. It came however as early as the days of Clement of Alexandria and the Muratorian Canon to acquire the sense of 'orthodox' as opposed to heresy. Lightfoot explained the change by saying that the heresies were

[1] *Adu. Gramm.* (K) X. 221, etc.

[2] On Ignatius *ad Smyrn.* 8.

'partial, scattered, localized, isolated.' But this was not the feeling of the Church itself. Justin complains that Marcion drew his adherents from every quarter; and did not the Church live in yearly expectation of the general apostacy which was to precede the end? I should suggest that into the original meaning of the word there flowed a stream of association from a controversy, which was more or less familiar to every educated Christian from boyhood—a controversy in which the word 'Catholic' suggested (1) truth absolute and admitting of no exception, and (2) truth which in practice had to protest against yet tolerate error,[1] 'accedere non indulgere,' as the grammarians say. No doubt the connexion would be much clearer if 'Catholic faith' and 'Catholic doctrine' preceded instead of following 'Catholic Church,' as they appear to do. But streams of association do not always follow logical courses. And it is worth noting that by Origen's time *καθολικός* can be applied to a book in the sense of 'canonical.'[2]

I am inclined to think that much the same may be said of the word 'canon.' It is at any rate curious that these two words, which have been more than others the watchwords of orthodoxy, bear in grammar practically the same meaning, and are both associated with the analogist doctrine of the universality of grammatical law. The two most prominent ecclesiastical uses of the word are of course (1) Church ordinances, (2) the catalogue, or list of sacred books. The first of these followed easily enough from the primary use of *κανών* for a ruler. The second is not quite so easy. Souter derives it from the use of *κανών* for a list—quite rightly, I think; but how did *κανών* come to mean a list?[3] According to Souter the connexion is that the ruler had marks or notches in it, but surely the grammatical use gives a far clearer connexion. For in grammar the word necessarily came to connote a list. The *κανών* was properly a sentence which laid down a rule, but in practice it was a paradigm.

[1] Perhaps we may add that the *καθολικά* were felt to be the safeguards of the heritage of *Ἑλληνισμός*, much as catholicity protected the 'faith once delivered.' Cf. Sext. Emp. *adu. Gramm.* X. 179.

[2] Souter, *History of the Canon*, p. 179, but he does not give the references.

[3] As it is frequently supposed, I think, that this Church use of 'canon' is derived from, or at any rate preceded by, the literary use of the word by the Alexandrine grammarians for the list of the classical authors in any department, I take this opportunity to comment on a doubtful piece of lexicography. The Paris Stephanus *s.u. κανών* has the following: 'Similiter *κανών* dicitur catalogus auctorum classicorum, prae ceteris legendorum, a grammaticis Alexandrinis confectus, *v.* Ruhnken, *Histor. Or.* p. xciv.' Evidently following this Liddell and Scott have *s.u.*, 'in Alexandrine Grammar collections of the old Greek authors were called *κανόνες*, as being models of excellence, classics, Ruhnken, *Hist. Or. Crit. Graec.* p. xciv. Cf. Quintilian X. 1, 54 and 59.' But Quintilian never suggests the word *κανών*, and when I turn to Ruhnken I find that he says nothing of the kind. Not only does he give no evidence, but he never even suggests that such lists were called *κανόνες*. He himself calls them 'canons,' but that is all.

A rather different view is given by Westcott, *History of the Canon*, Appendix A: 'One instance of the metaphorical use of the word requires special notice. The Alexandrine grammarians spoke of the Classic Greek authors as a whole as *ὁ κανών*, the absolute standard of pure language, a perfect model of composition, *v.* Redepenning, *Origines* I. 12.' Here again we seem to have the same confusion between *τὸ σήμαινον* and *τὸ σημαινόμενον*. For Redepenning says nothing of the sort. He merely remarks, referring to Quint. X. 1, 54, that no living authors were included by the Alexandrines in 'dem bald allgemein anerkannten Kanon.' The fact that Quintilian uses the word *ordo* of these lists suggests that the Greek name was *τάξις*, which is confirmed by some of the later evidence quoted by Ruhnken.

We may say in the form of a sentence that nouns in *-α* make their genitive in *-ης*, but in practice the schoolboy recited *μοῦσα—μούσης*, etc., as we actually find in the *Theodosii Canones*. Thus again the educated Christian thought of it as a catalogue, and one moreover which carried with it an authority, to which indeed exception was sometimes taken, but which did not in analogist theory at least admit of exception.

It is possible that this disquisition on these two words may seem to some as trivial as it certainly is speculative. And I confess I have an object somewhat outside my main subject. It seems to me that the terminology of the studies, which formed the staple of general education, deserves more study than it generally receives. It is not sufficiently remembered that grammar in particular was a science which aroused a vast amount of interest, and that it was, perhaps even more than rhetoric, a study with which the upper and middle classes at any rate were thoroughly familiar. A terminology created under such conditions has a force, a warmth, a colour, which makes its influence felt over fields widely removed from it. Further, I think, we may expect that such an influence would be felt, not so much in what we call the classical literature with its firm traditions, as in that great literature of the middle classes which, untrammelled by tradition, was called into existence by the Church. The influence of philosophy on Christian thought and language has of course been examined very carefully. The influence of grammar and rhetoric is doubtless of much less importance, but it deserves more careful treatment than, as far as I can judge, it has at present received.

F. H. Colson.

THE PHONETICS OF *MR-* IN LATIN.

A. The Vestine Inscription with *brat.*

T. Vetio | duno | didet | Herclo | Iovio | brat. | data.

1. This inscription, most easily consulted in Diehl's *Alt-lat. Inschriften*, No. 70, has been explained, beyond any reasonable doubt, by von Planta (*Osk.-Umbr. Gram.* 1. 304) as follows: 'The entire inscription is accordingly to be rendered thus: *T. Vettius donum dat Herculi Iouio; merito data*, sc. *est* or *sunt*, according as the votive offering was feminine singular or neuter plural.' The very abbreviation of *brat.* favours a formulaic word such as *merito.* Von Planta accounts also for all other dialectic occurrences of the stem *brato-*, vindicating a sense of *meritum* (quasi *gratia*) for all of them.

2. Morphologically—I am speaking of IE. patterns—the root *mer* is entitled to an equivalent *mrā*, cf. e.g. Lat. *trans*, participle to a root *trā*, alongside of the root *ter* in Skr. *tárati*, 'crosses.' From *mrā* came Italic *bra-*.

3. If a scholar like von Planta has proposed a satisfactory explanation for Italic *brat(od)*, why has it not been welcomed? Because of what looks almost like a conspiracy in favour of the contention that Lat. (Ital.) *fr-* results from *mr-*. This contention is most improbable on physiological grounds, and lacks the support of any certain, or even good, etymology. The examples given in Brugmann, *Gr.* 1. 369, and in Stolz 134, are as follows: (1) *fraces*, 'oil-lees': *marcidus*, 'wilted'; (2) *fretus*, 'strait': *βράττω*, 'boil'; (3) *fremo*, 'groan': *βρέμω*. These etymologies have all been replaced by better ones by Persson in his *Beiträge* (see the indices). (1) We might accept *fraces* from **mraces*[1] without accepting *fr-* from *mr-*, explaining the *f-* as due to the inworking of *fracta*. Again, the connection of *fraces* with Skr. *bhráṁçati*, *cadit*, etc. (see Zubaty, *KZ.* 31. 56), is entirely admissible, and not to be disproved by mere denial. Or else, in rustic words, we might admit, and after a good IE. pattern (*πτωκ-*: *πτακ-*), nom. *flōces* (*ō*—so Vendryes, *Intensité*, p. 118—from *ōu*): acc. **flaces*, whence *fraces*, with *r* after *fracta*, again. But we do best, after all, to follow Persson (l.c. p. 929) and connect with Eng. *dregs*. (2) *Fretus*, 'current in a strait': better than Persson's solution, perhaps, is to start from a primate *sr-etos*: Skr. *sar-ít-*, 'stream,' etc. For the suffix cf. Homeric *νιφ-ετός*, 'snowstorm.' (3) *Fremit*; primate *sr-ém-eti*. For the root *s(w)er* cf. the lexica on Lat. *sermo* (initial *s-*, not *sw-*). The root *swer*—still a different *swer*, an it please Heaven and the cynical jury—also meant to make

[1] In Irish *mraich*, 'malt,' the stem *mr-ac* comes in fact from *mr-ā* : *mer*, 'pulverize' (see § 11).

a humming noise, cf. the lexica on Lat. *susurrus*, noting Skr. *swará-s*, 'cry.' For the extension *sr-em* cf. Lat. *tr-em : ter* (see Brugmann, *Kvg.* 297).

4. The considerations quoted and advanced against the phonetic process Lat. *fr-* from *mr-* reveal how questionable are all the etymologies adduced in its favour. Not one of them remotely approaches in probability von Planta's etymology of *brat.* The testimony of *brat.* is raised beyond any intelligent doubt by the correspondence of Lat. *breuis* and *βραχύς* (cf. *leuis : ἐλαχύς*) with Av. *mərəzu-* in *mərəzu-jva-*, 'short-lived' (see Persson, l.c. index), cf. *breuis*, 'short-lived,' ap. *Thes. L.L.* 2. 2174, 30; 2176, 18 et 22.

B. Latin *formido.*

5. Two examples remain for Lat. *for-* as alleged (by Solmsen) to come from IE. *mr̥-*, viz. (1) *formica*, 'ant,' (2) *formido*, 'dread.' (1) He who believes that the IE. words for 'ant' as listed in the lexica under *μύρμηξ* and *formica* have got their initial sounds by uninterrupted phonetic process from an original *m-* (or *w-* or *bh-*) ought not to stall even before the phonetic charities indulgences and vagaries of the pre-Curtian days. But as to *formica* see the next section. (2) As regards *formido*, I divined several years ago (see *CP.* 6. 360) that it was cognate with Eng. *dread.* I can now account for its connexion with absolute completeness. If Gothic had preserved the verb *dread* its form would be *drēdan*, a *dh* extension of IE. *dhrē*, as *rēdan* (Lat. *re-or*) is an extension of IE. *rē.* Cf. *δαρ-θ-άνει* : Skr. *drā̆-ti*, 'sleeps,' IE. root *drē.* In Latin, *drē* is represented by *dormio*, and *dhrē* is entitled to a parallel form **formio.* The parallelism is complete: *drē* (Skr. *drā́ti*) : *drē-dh* (*dr̥-dh*, in *δαρθάνει*) : *dr̥mĭ-* (whence *dormio*) :: *dhrē* (no example) : *dhrē-dh* (O.Sax. *-drādan*, O.Eng. *draədan*) : *dhr̥mĭ-* (in Lat. *formido*). Q.E.D.

C. Lat. *formica :* the IE. names for the 'ant.'

6. In *IF.* 33. 367 van Wijk has arrived, by subtle and complicated combinations, at a unitary primate for the IE. words for the ant. For my part, I think that there was no such primate, but several forms centering on the description of the ant as (1) the maker of granules, (2) the pismire. In dialectic *βορ-μāκ-* (*β* a script form for *F*) and *formica* I find in the posteriora words (cognate words) meaning granule; cf. Lat. *mīca :* (*σ*)*μῑκ-ρός*, 'small' (Doric *μικκός* with hypocoristic *κκ*) and OHG. *smāhi.*[1] In *βορ-μāκ-* the prius is from the root *wer*, 'turn' 'twist'; cf. Lat. *uermis* (borer) : Eng. *worm.* Whether the name 'turn-granule' refers to the sand particles brought out at the mouth of the anthill or to the 'ant-eggs' carried in the mandibles of the ants is a thing not to be determined. The root *wer* is extended by *t* in Lat. *uertit* and by a guttural in *Fέργα*, 'works' (original sense of *Fεργ-*, 'turn

[1] Here *ā* = IE. *ē*, but the root *smēi-k* (so Hirt, *Ablaut*, No. 96) belongs with *smāi* (*ib.* No. 95; others in contempt of Doric *σμᾶσαμενα* write *smēi*), 'friare' ('rub,' 'wipe,' 'anoint'): *smēi* in *σμήχει*, 'rubs' ('grinds'), *σμῆμα*, 'scrubbing material' (sand before soap); cf. Lat. *rāpum* vs., OH. *rāba* (*ā* from *ē*). Of course *α* in *βορμᾶκ-* may be due to a paradigmatic levelling between a pre-Greek nominative *smēk-s* or *smōk-s* : gen. *smək-ós.*

the spindle,' as Meringer has seen). For 'ant' as for 'worm' the original sense of 'borer' is well suited.

7. In Skr. *vam-rī́-*, 'ant,' there has been some sort of contamination between the stems of *Fρόμος*, 'worm,' and of *uermis*, whether *v[r]am-ri* or *vram-i-*, resulting in the more easy vocable *vamrī-*. It is not particularly likely that the root *vam* played a rôle in the shift, but we may note Plautine 'apes mel uomunt.'

8. If we give to the Hesychian gloss *ὅρμικας μυρμ†ηξ* (corrected to *μύρμακας*) its full face value its primate stem was *wor-smĭk-* (*i* as in *formica*).

9. Lat. *formīca*, if shifted from **uormica*, amounts to 'quae micas forat'; or, by another turn of popular etymology, we may render it by 'quae micas fert.' See W. Wackernagel ap. Andresen, *Volks-Etymologie*, p. 36.

10. Skr. *valmī́kam* ('lumps' or 'anthills' on the hands or feet) originally meant, I take it, with-ants (*valmī-* = Lat. *uermis;* see on the confix *-kam*, 'with,' *JAOS.* 34. 331 sq.). The more usual *valmī́ka-s*, 'anthill,' is secondary in point of gender.

11. In *μύρ-μāκ-* the prius is IE. *mur-* (cf. e.g. Brugmann-Thumb, *Gr. Gram.* § 68[1]; and note the secondary Sanskrit root *tul*, 'guṇated' to *tol*: Lat. *tollo*), doublet to *mṛ-*, 'pulverize' (see Walde s.v. *moretum*). The same root *mer*, extended by *w(o)-* (cf. Skr. *tū́rv:* root *tṛ/tur; jūrv:* root *jṛ/jur; dhūrv:* root *dhvṛ/dhur*) is found in the Celtic and some of the German names for the ant (conveniently listed in Uhlenbeck's *Ai. Wbch.* s.v. *vamrás*. This uncompounded and shorter name meant something like 'crumbler' or 'crumber.' Cf. Slavic *mrva*, 'mica.'

12. In Av. *maori-š*, 'ant,' *ao* is unquestionably a diphthong to the secondary root stage *mur*, just as Skr. *tol* is the 'guṇa' of the secondary root *tul*, and *meuron* is the proper primate of some of the Germanic forms. This I interpret to mean that the *mur-* and *meur-* forms (: root *mer*, 'crumble') got their *u*-colour from the root *m(y)ēw*, found in Skr. *mū́-tram*, 'urine'; cf. the English forms *pis-mire* and *piss-ant*, and Dutch forms with the same sense cited by Kluge, s.v. *ameise*. The *mir-* primates listed by van Wijk will show intrusion from the sept of *mingo;* see Walde, who suggests a briefer root *mey*, and indeed this root is exhibited in the Brāhmaṇa compound *go-máya-*, 'cow-dung,' and in lexical Skr. *māyu-*, 'bile.'

13. The objection that in *for-mica*, *Fορ-μāκ-*, etc., we have monosyllabic governing (imperatival) priora ought not to be raised in seriousness, unless the objector is prepared to show that *Fορ-μυρ-*, etc., substantially differ from the priora in Vedic *sthā́-raçman τλή-θυμος*, Av. *(ni-)δā́-snaiθiš-* (v. Wackernagel, *Ai. Gram.* 2. 1, pp. 316-317). That the priora *μυρ Fορ* are not graded like monosyllabic imperatives (Lat. *fer-ei; ἔξ-ει*, etc.) I freely grant, still *mur* is graded like Skr. *-tur* in *viçvá-tur-*, omni-superans ('tyrannus'), and a reversed order **tur-viçva-*, after the pattern of **tara(t)-viçva-* (typically correct; cf. the proper names *Jayat-sena/Jayā-sena*), is not to be declared impossible. The compounds with governing priora were moribund, and in no case are exceptions

from a predominant order to be taken too seriously, especially by those who recall that half a decade ago our popular usage was fluctuating between *birdman* and *manbird* (cf. *upstart* and *startup*). We might even with a rare and moribund type of compound, those with governing priora, suppose that the **tur-viçva-* type had been ousted by the reversed type of *viçvá-tur-*. The *o*-grade of *Fορ* looks to be derived from compounds in *-wor*, let us say *pro-wor*.[1]

14. To escape the theory of composition for some of the words for ant we may derive *Fορμᾱκ-* and Lat. *formica* (for **uormica*) from the primate *worsmā/ī-*, 'urine'; cf. *οὐρεῖν*, 'urinate,' and Lith. *uersmẽ*, 'fons.' A somewhat similar primate **murma*, 'crumb,' will serve as the foundation for *μύρμᾱ-κ-*, quasi 'crumber.'

D. Latin *forma*.

15. The fact that *forma* seems to be a sort of metathesis of *μορφή* is pure accident. For *forma*, 'shape,' we have an excellent source in the root of *ferire*, 'strike' (cf. *τύπος* : *τύπτει*), so that a *forma* was a sort of 'Schlag,' or even meant 'cut.' But *μορφή* comes from the root *mer*, 'press' (cf. Skr. *mar-d-ati*) and 'rub' (see § 11), the rub being the contour left after a pressing or rubbing process.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

ON THE MEANING OF ΒΑΔΗΝ AND ΔΡΟΜΩΙ IN GREEK HISTORIANS OF THE FIFTH CENTURY.

SINCE the English author, who has written in the greatest detail and with most acceptance on Greek warfare in the fifth century, has now declared definitely that *δρόμῳ* cannot mean 'at the run,'[2] but should be translated both in Thucydides and Herodotus 'at the quick step' in contrast to *βάδην* 'at the slow step,' it may be worth while to re-examine the evidence, and to give some reasons for maintaining the translation 'at the double' at least in the descriptions of battles given us by Thucydides, Xenophon, and Herodotus.

I begin with Thucydides, the author with whom Dr. Grundy is dealing. There are, I believe, two passages in his history (not quoted by Dr. Grundy) in which *δρόμῳ* almost certainly means 'at the double' or 'at a run.' In Book III. 111 the Ambraciots perceive the Peloponnesians, by whom they were being deserted, already some distance away and retiring rapidly. In trying to overtake them they broke into a run (*ἔθεον δρόμῳ*). Here it is obvious that a quick march would have been

[1] The ancient, because quite isolated, Sanskrit compound *prāḍ-vivāka-s* (see Meillet, *MSL.* 18. 315) may as well be rendered by 'judging-cases' as by 'case-deciding'; and in Av. *vī-kərəṭ-uštāna-*, 'destroying-life,' there is no reason to doubt that the governing prius *kərəṭ-* is typically like Skr. *kṛt-*, 'making.'

[2] Dr. G. B. Grundy, *Thucydides and the History of his Age*, p. 269.

quite inadequate for their purpose; the Ambraciots must have gone at their best pace. Again, in the description of the landing on Sphacteria (Thuc. IV. 31 sq.) ἐχώρουν δρόμῳ is best rendered 'at the double,' since speed and surprise were plainly essential factors in the Athenian assault on the Spartan outpost (cf. Thuc. IV. 32). Nor can I regard the passage on which Dr. Grundy relies, the description of the hurried march of Brasidas through Thessaly (Thuc. IV. 78 sq.), as decisive. No doubt in it Thucydides applies the terms δρόμῳ and διέδραμεν (ch. 79) to a march of several days. But there is not the smallest hint that he is using technical language with rigid accuracy. His purpose is to emphasize the extreme rapidity of a march in a case where speed was necessary to success. He might fairly expect that the words would be interpreted by the context and not treated as technical terms. In support of this I would quote a parallel from Herodotus. In his description of the disorderly advance of the Persian hosts at Plataea (IX. 59), the phrase ἐδίωκον ὡς ἕκαστος ποδῶν εἶχον implies in the context full speed—i.e. as I shall argue below at the double—but no one would infer from the similar phrase in VI. 116 that the Athenian hoplites doubled all the way home from Marathon to Athens. In fine, even in Thucydides it would seem best to regard δρόμῳ as naturally meaning 'at the double,' and to treat his description of the march of Brasidas as an intelligible and pardonable exaggeration.

If we turn to the most military of Greek historians, Xenophon, the case is plainer. It is true that in his works we find βάδην used for slowly, at foot's pace, perhaps even for 'at a slow march.' The usage is as early as Herodotus (IX. 57, cf. *infra*), and is most frequent in later military historians such as Polybius and Arrian. Further, we find in Xenophon the contrast between βάδην and δρόμῳ (cf. *infra*), and even in a non-military passage a similar antithesis between βάδην and τρέχων (*Cyrop.* II. 2. 30). But in the accounts of actual fighting δρόμῳ appears to mean at the double. Thus in the battle of Coronea (*Hell.* IV. 3. 17) it is used of the final charge of the contending armies, which even Dr. Grundy admits may have been made at the double. Again in the encounter between Agesilaus and Tissaphernes (*Hell.* III. 4. 23) it is used of peltasts, who are ordered to take the lead in a charge made at a run: ἐκέλευσε τὰ δέκα ἀφ' ἥβης θεῖν ὁμόσε αὐτοῖς, τοῖς δὲ πελτασταῖς εἶπε δρόμῳ ὑφηγεῖσθαι. Lastly, in the description of the Greek advance at Cunaxa (*Anab.* I. 8. 18 sq.) we hear first that a part of the Greek phalanx which had got a little behind quickened to a run (ἤρξατο δρόμῳ θεῖν) and then they all ran (πάντες ἔθεον); finally, when the barbarians are in full flight, the Greeks in hot pursuit shout to one another not to run but to keep their ranks (μὴ θεῖν δρόμῳ ἀλλ' ἐν τάξει ἕπεσθαι).

These descriptions of charges create a strong presumption that δρόμῳ means 'at a run' or 'at the double,' but the decisive passages are two, which show that βάδην properly qualified can be used for 'quick march,' and is still contrasted with δρόμῳ, which must therefore mean 'at the double.' In *Anab.* IV. 6. 25 we read: οἱ μὲν πελτασταὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων δρόμῳ ἔθεον πρὸς τοὺς παρατεταγμένους, Χειρίσοφος δὲ βάδην ταχὺ ἐφείπετο σὺν τοῖς ὁπλίταις, which can only mean the peltasts charged at the double, while the hoplites followed at foot's pace, but rapidly—i.e. at a quick march. Similarly in *Hell.* V. 4. 51 sq., after hearing that the Thebans retreated before Agesilaus at a run (δρόμῳ ἔθεον . . . ἀποχωρεῖν δρόμῳ . . . παραθέοντας), we are told that the Sciritae when they in turn were forced to retire θᾶττον ἢ βάδην ἀπῆλθον. It seems clear then that Xenophon means by βάδην at foot's pace, or at a slow march, and by δρόμῳ at a run or at the double; and that when he is obliged to mention a quick march he uses, not δρόμῳ, but βάδην with a qualifying word or words (βάδην ταχύ, θᾶττον ἢ βάδην), a fact which surely proves that there was not a technical word for 'quick march.'

Coming last to Herodotus, the least military of the three historians, and

therefore the least likely to use technical terms, there can be little question that in a non-military passage describing the rush of the seven conspirators at the Magi (III. 77) ἦισαν δρόμῳ ἐς τὸν ἀνδρεῶνα, δρόμῳ should be given its natural meaning 'at a run.' In the account of the retreat of Amompharetus before Plataea (IX. 57) βάδην need mean no more than 'at foot's pace,' though 'at a slow march' is a sense very suitable to the context. But in the description of Mardonius' pursuit (IX. 59) δρόμῳ must mean 'at the double,' since, after saying of Mardonius ἦγε τοὺς Πέρσας δρόμῳ, Herodotus adds that the other troops followed at their best pace (ἐδίωκον ὡς ποδῶν ἕκαστος εἶχον) with their ranks in utter disorder, plainly implying that the whole army was bent on making the utmost speed. Lastly, in the passage which is of the greatest historical interest, the story of Marathon, Herodotus (VI. 112) four times declares that the Athenians charged δρόμῳ, and adds that they were the first troops within his knowledge to do so. Now it is in itself unlikely that hoplites had hitherto always attacked at a slow march, and never seen the advantage in impetus to be gained from a quicker step, though fear of disordering their ranks might well have restrained them from charging at the double. And comparison with Mardonius' attack at Plataea makes it fairly certain that at Marathon too Herodotus means by δρόμῳ 'at a run' or 'at the double.' The difficulty of a body of hoplites charging a mile at the double, which first led Dr. Grundy (*Great Persian War*, p. 188) to suggest (as Leake and Bähr had already done) that δρόμῳ should be translated 'at the quick step' is better met by the other suggestion he mentions—viz. that Herodotus has ascribed to the whole length of the Athenian advance (a mile) a form of movement (the double) which was only really adopted when the Greeks came within range of missiles. It is worth observing that both Diodorus (XIV. 23. 1) and Polyaenus represent Clearchus as advancing slowly at Cunaxa till within bowshot of the enemy, and then bidding his men charge at speed.[1] I do not maintain the truth of this, for it is inconsistent with the account of Xenophon; but if the story in these late writers goes back as seems likely to Ephorus, it shows that in the fourth century this was a recognized method of dealing with the Persian archers.

It is not then, I think, too much to say that to the Greeks the main antithesis is between βάδην, 'at foot's pace,' 'at a walk,' and δρόμῳ, 'at a run,' 'at the double,' and that in descriptions of battles this distinction is absolutely valid, so that when a careful writer like Xenophon wishes to mention a quick march he is driven to qualify the term βάδην. The use of βάδην and δρόμῳ as military terms corresponds closely to their natural meaning in ordinary life, βάδην being used for ordinary marching, and δρόμῳ in all accounts of battles for charging at the double.

W. W. How.

Merton College, Oxford.

[1] Polyaenus actually uses the terms βάδην and δρόμῳ (II. 2. 3).

LECTIO SENATVS AND *CENSVS* UNDER AVGVSTVS.

In the *Mon. Ancyr.* II. 2-11 Augustus makes four statements: (1) He carried out a *lectio senatus* on three occasions. (2) He held a census in his sixth consulship (28 B.C.) with Agrippa as his colleague, and completed the *lustrum* after an interval of forty-two years, the number of citizens registered being four millions and sixty-three thousand. (3) He completed a second *lustrum* in 8 B.C. invested with the consular *imperium* and without a colleague, the number of citizens having increased by one hundred and seventy thousand. (4) He completed a third *lustrum* in 14 A.D. again invested with the consular *imperium*, but with Tiberius as his colleague, the number of citizens having again increased by seven hundred and four thousand.

That Augustus held a census in the three years specified must be accepted as beyond doubt, although no record remains beyond his own statement of that in 8 B.C. It cannot be asserted with equal certainty that no census was begun or contemplated at any other date,[1] but it is impossible to believe that, if another *lustrum* had been completed, Augustus would have suppressed it. But, while the statement with regard to the census is precise and conclusive, that concerning the *lectio senatus* is vague and indeterminate. The question arises therefore whether the three occasions on which a *lectio* was carried out corresponded with the three years in which a census was held, or belonged to other dates. It is sometimes thought to be in favour of the former view that in the pre-Sullan republic a *lectio senatus* was, if not a part, at least an essential preliminary to a census. But the circumstances of the following period may well have loosened the connexion between the two sides of censorial activity. No doubt a census must always have included the issue of a senatorial *album*, but the automatic supply of the senate from ex-quaestors would make this at ordinary times a mere process of registration, while if, during the long period in which no census was held, a real *lectio* was desirable, there seems no reason why some of the censors appointed during this period should not have discharged this part of their duty, even though they failed to complete a census.[2] That this was possible is proved by the action of Julius

[1] I attach no value in this connexion to Dio's statement (54, 1) that censors were appointed in 22 B.C. The step was apparently taken by Augustus as a protest against the suggestion that he should himself become censor for life. Not only did nothing come of this abortive appointment, but the date stands in no symmetrical relation to any other census or *lectio senatus*, an objection which a consideration of the Augustan method in these matters will show to be fatal.

[2] As an example, we may cite the case of the censors of 64 B.C., who, according to Dio (37, 9), were obstructed in the *lectio senatus* by tribunes and then resigned. If however they had been allowed to complete the *lectio*, it would presumably have held good, even though the census was not held.

Caesar, who, though holding no census, carried out a very drastic *lectio senatus*. To obtain something more conclusive as to the dates of the *lectiones*, we shall have to examine certain statements of Dio Cassius. Before however leaving the Monument, we may note two things: (1) The fact that the census was taken three times, as well as another important detail, is confirmed by Suetonius (*Aug.* 27), though no dates are given, and though the statement is vitiated by a serious blunder. *Recepit et morum legumque regimen aeque perpetuum, quo iure, quamquam sine censurae honore, censum tamen populi ter egit, primum ac tertium cum collega, medium solus.* It has been thought that this comes direct from the Monument, but the suggestion seems to me wholly ruled out by the fatal misconception about the *cura legum morumque*. Part of the statement may of course come indirectly from the Monument, but, if Suetonius had himself consulted it, he could not have represented Augustus as making use of a competence which he expressly declares that he refused, especially as in two cases Augustus specifies quite a different competence, viz. the *consulare imperium*. As to the first census, it was held nineteen years before the first of the three dates on which, according to the Monument, the *cura* was offered. (2) The interval between the first and the second census was exactly twenty years, the two occasions coinciding respectively with the commencement and the fourth renewal of the *imperium proconsulare*, while the interval between the second and third census was twenty-one years, the *lustrum* being completed in the year subsequent to the sixth renewal of the *imperium* in 13 A.D. We shall perhaps find below an explanation of this slight divergence from complete symmetry.

When we turn to Dio Cassius, we seem at first sight confronted with nothing but hopeless discrepancies from the Monument. He obviously believes (a belief shared among other modern scholars by Mommsen) that a *lectio* and a census always accompanied one another, and, while omitting all mention of a census in 8 B.C. and 14 A.D., he represents a *lectio senatus* and a census to have been carried out on four occasions, in 28 B.C., 18 B.C., 11 B.C., and 4 A.D., certain preliminary steps being taken, except in the last instance, in the preceding years, 29, 19, and 12 B.C. It follows, if we accept the entire statements of Dio, adopt his view that a *lectio* must coincide with a census, and add, as the authority of Augustus compels us to do, the census of 8 B.C. and 14 A.D., that the *lectio senatus* and the census took place each on six and not on three occasions.

We will now examine the occasions on which according to Dio a census was held. As to the first held in 28 B.C. there is no dispute, for it is confirmed by Augustus, and moreover Dio and Suetonius make it clear that the first of the three *lectiones* mentioned in the Monument accompanied this census. This under the circumstances was natural. A census had not been held for over forty years, and the senate was crowded with unworthy members, so that there was urgent necessity for the exercise of both censorial functions. It

does not follow however that they would always be carried out conjointly.[1]

It is clear that the first steps were taken in 29 B.C., for under that year Dio writes (52, 42), *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα τιμητεύσας σὺν τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ . . . τὴν βουλὴν ἐξήτασε, πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ . . . παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν ἐκ τῶν ἐμφυλίων πολέμων ἐβούλευον, ὥστε ἐς χιλίους τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς γερουσίας αὐξηθῆναι.* By first appealing to the consciences of senators and urging them to become *δικασταὶς ἑαυτοῖς* Augustus induced fifty (sixty in Suet.) to withdraw of their own accord, *ἔπειτα καὶ ἄλλους ἑκατὸν καὶ τεσσαράκοντα μιμήσασθαί σφας ἠνάγκασε.* It is of course to this *lectio* that Suetonius refers in *Aug.* 35: *senatorum affluentem numerum . . . (erant enim super mille et quidam indignissimi . . .) ad modum pristinum redegit duabus lectionibus, prima ipsorum arbitratu quo uir uirum legit, secunda suo et Agrippae.* I take these *duae lectiones* to refer to the two processes of purgation described by Dio, the former probably belonging to 29, the latter to 28 B.C., when Augustus and Agrippa were certainly working together.[2] At any rate, Dio agrees with the Monument that the census was in the sixth consulship (28 B.C.); *ἐν δ' οὖν τῷ τότε πάροντι . . . τὰς ἀπογραφὰς ἐξετέλεσε καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς πρόκριτος τῆς γερουσίας ἐπεκλήθη* (53, 1).

We come to the question, by what right or in virtue of what position did Augustus perform these censorial acts? Putting aside the double blunder of Suetonius in deriving the censorial activity of Augustus from the *cura legum morumque*, which was only offered in 19 B.C. and then refused, and rejecting anything but an untechnical interpretation of Dio's *τιμητεύσας σὺν τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ*, we must consider the entry in the *Fasti Venusini* under 28 B.C., *imp. Caesar VI. M. Agrippa II. idem censoria potestate lustrum fecerunt* (*C.I.L.* IX. p. 422). Mommsen supposes that a law was passed in 29 B.C. conferring the *censoria potestas* on the *consules designati*, and that Augustus and Agrippa retained this until the *lustrum* was completed in the next year. But the *censoria potestas* was always dormant in the consular *imperium*, therefore neither Augustus nor Agrippa needed any conferment of *censoria potestas* for 28 B.C., while Augustus was also consul in 29, and even, if he had resigned the office before the end of the year, it must be remembered that he was still *omnium rerum potitus*. As Augustus explicitly states that on the two later occasions he held the census *consulari cum imperio*, it is safe to assume that the census in 28 depended on the same *imperium*, exercised by Augustus as consul. All that was necessary therefore was that the senate should decree that a census should be taken, a decree which, in the absence of censors, automatically evoked the *censoria*

[1] The fact that Claudius as censor held a *lectio* and a census together may well be explained by his antiquarian proclivities.

[2] I cannot agree either with Pelham or Shuckburgh in their explanation of the words *duabus lectionibus*. The former makes them refer to 28 and 18 B.C., but (*a*) there is no evidence that Agrippa acted with Augustus in the latter *lectio*, and (*b*) the words *ipsorum arbitratu*, etc., do not cover the expulsion of 140 senators in 28. Shuckburgh believes that Suetonius has reversed the order of the *lectiones* of 28 and 18 B.C. But (*a*) such a reversal, especially in the face of the emphatic *prima* and *secunda*, is improbable, and (*b*) the words *ipsorum arbitratu*, etc., do not suit the *lectio* of 18 B.C., when the scheme of selection by lot-appointed committees of five was found unworkable.

potestas of the consuls. The same course seems to have been adopted in municipal towns. When the senate at Rome decreed a census, the *decuriones* passed a local decree for its performance, and in consequence the *IIuiri* or *IIIIuiri* for the year became *IIuiri* or *IIIIuiri quinquennales*. It is in this way that I should explain the title found at Suasa of *IIuir quinq. ex s. c. et d. d.* (*C.I.L.* XI. 6167).

The next occasion on which Dio attributes censorial activity to Augustus is in 19-18 B.C. In the former year he is represented as receiving the *cura legum morumque* for five years, and along with it *τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν τῶν τιμητῶν ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον* (54, 10). Dio does not therefore, like Suetonius, derive the *censoria potestas* from the *cura morum*, but he clearly regards them as in some way complementary to one another, a confusion which makes him represent the latter as given for five years, instead of for the completion of a specified act or acts. There is no doubt, I think, that Dio believed the *censoria potestas* to have been given for the purpose of holding a census next year, but, when he reaches that year, he makes no special mention of a census, though he dwells with considerable detail on the method by which a *lectio senatus* was carried out. Finding the senate still too numerous, Augustus *τὸ βουλευτικὸν ἐξητάσε*, and, as none would voluntarily withdraw as in 29, and to avoid the odium of acting alone, he at first resorted to a complicated combination of selection and lot. This however proving abortive, *αὐτός τὰ λοιπὰ ἀνελέξατο καὶ αὐτὸς τοὺς ἐνδέοντας προσείλετο, ὥστε ἐς ἑξακοσίους τοὺς πάντας ἀποδειχθῆναι* (54, 13). It was clearly a drastic purgation, and, according to Dio, Augustus would have liked to make it still more drastic.

That no census was held this year the silence of Augustus is sufficient proof, and indeed, with whatever methods of decentralization, a census was now too formidable a task to be repeated after ten years. But Dio's account of the *lectio senatus* is too explicit and circumstantial to be discarded, and it is in this year that we must place the second of the three *lectiones* recorded by Augustus. It was exactly ten years after the census and *lectio* of 28, and just as those proceedings had ushered in the first period of his *imperium*, so its renewal for five years, accompanied by the official recognition of Agrippa as *collega imperii et consors tribuniciae potestatis*[1] was a fitting opportunity for completing the unfinished work of purging the still inflated senate. Mommsen, believing that a *lectio senatus* was bound to coincide with a census, suggests that this was merely an informal purgation of the senate which Augustus, unwilling to revive painful memories, omitted from his list of formal *lectiones*. No doubt Augustus would avoid direct allusion to these painful episodes, and that, as it seems to me, was precisely the reason why he made this part of his statement so vague and indeterminate in point of date. After all, the memories of 18 B.C. were not more painful than those of 28 B.C., the reference to which no one disputes.

[1] Dio records both points under 18 B.C. (54, 12): *πρῶτον μὲν αὐτὸς πέντε τῆς προστασίας ἔτη, ἐπειδήπερ ὁ δεκέτης χρόνος ἐξήκων ἦν, προσέθετο, . . . ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τῷ Ἀγρίππᾳ ἄλλα τε ἐξ ἴσου ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὴν ἐξουσίαν τὴν δημαρχικὴν ἐς τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον ἔδωκε.*

In 13 B.C. the *imperium* was again renewed for five years, and Agrippa's *tribunicia potestas* extended for the same time, but no *lectio* or census is recorded. In 12 B.C. however Dio asserts, erroneously as we know, that Augustus was again elected ἐπιμελητὴς καὶ ἐπανορθωτὴς τῶν τρόπων for five years (54, 30), a statement confuted by Augustus, who declares that he refused the position in 11 B.C. (*Grk.* 3, 13-14). Under the same year Dio makes the curious statement that Augustus in delivering a funeral oration over Agrippa, caused the body to be covered ὅτι τὰ τῶν τιμητῶν ἔπραττε (54, 28). At any rate, under 11 B.C. he says, ὁ Αὔγουστος ἀπογραφάς τε ἐποιήσατο, πάντα τὰ ὑπάρχοντα οἱ καθάπερ τις ἰδιώτης ἀπογραψάμενος καὶ τὴν βουλὴν κατελέξατο (54, 35). We have no choice but to reject this statement *in toto*. Not only is the silence of the Monument conclusive against a census, but the date, seven years after a *lectio* and three years before an undoubted census, stands in no symmetrical relation to any other *lectio* or census, and this by itself is a fatal objection. Dio believed that on a previous occasion (19 B.C.) the *cura legum morumque* and *censoria potestas* had been given together, and that a *lectio* and census had followed, and as in some unexplained way he assigns a second five years' conferment of the *cura* to a date seven and not five years later than the previous grant, he infers that the concomitants and consequences were identical.

In 8 B.C. Dio tells us (55, 6) that the *imperium* was renewed for ten years; μετὰ δὲ δὴ ταῦτα τὴν ἡγεμονίαν . . . ἐπειδὴ τὰ δέκα ἔτη τὰ δεύτερα ἐξεληλύθει ἄκων δῆθεν αὖθις ὑπέστη. In the same year Augustus declares, though Dio is silent, that he held his second census. Just as in holding the first twenty years before the dormant censorial competence of the consular office had been evoked by senatorial decree, so on this occasion, though no longer consul, he was invested with the *consulare imperium*. Then Agrippa had been his colleague; now Tiberius was in Germany and the two young Caesars were still boys, so that Augustus acted alone and without support. I believe, for reasons which will appear below, that there was no *lectio senatus*, though of course the senatorial album was revised up to date. The senate had been reduced to its normal number ten years before, and there was probably no special necessity to stir up the excitement and possible odium which a *lectio* would produce, and which his present solitary position would make him more anxious to avoid.[1]

It was perhaps this personal motive which explains a slight dislocation in the orderly sequence of events in the years 3 and 4 A.D. That year was the proper date for the fourth renewal of the *imperium*, and accordingly Dio says under 3 A.D. (55, 12), τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ τότε τὸ τέταρτον, ἐκβιασθεὶς δῆθεν, ὑπεδέξατο. But it is not until the next year, 4 A.D., eleven years after the

[1] It is curious that Dio does not mention this census, but it is worth notice that it is always a *lectio senatus* which he is most careful to record. Thus under 28 and 18 B.C. and 4 A.D., while making the briefest mention of a census, he dilates on the *lectio*. In the present case I imagine that, finding no notice of a *lectio* in his authorities, he thought it unnecessary to record the census.

census of 8 B.C., that Dio reports a *lectio* and census. His account is extraordinary, but sufficiently explicit with regard to the *lectio senatus*. *κἀκ τούτων ἐπιθαρσήσας ὡς καὶ διαδόχους καὶ βοηθοὺς ἔχων διαλέξαι τὴν γερουσίαν αὖθις ἠθέλησε, καὶ δέκα βουλευτὰς οὓς μάλιστα ἐτίμα προβαλόμενος τρεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἐξεταστὰς ἀπέδειξεν, οὓς ὁ κλῆρος εἵλετο* (55, 13). So far there is no difficulty, and Suetonius by mentioning a *triumuiratum legendi senatus* among other new or revived offices (*Aug.* 37) confirms at least one detail. More than this, in the words *ἐπιθαρσήσας ὡς διαδόχους καὶ βοηθοὺς ἔχων* Dio suggests an explanation of the year's postponement of the *lectio*. In 3 A.D. Augustus was alone and in trouble. Tiberius was still in Rhodes, Lucius Caesar was dead, and Gaius Caesar was dying of his wound. But in 4 A.D. Tiberius had returned, had become adopted son, and had received a renewal of his interrupted *tribunicia potestas, ne successor in incerto foret.* By this change of circumstances Augustus found himself as well backed for the invidious task of a *lectio* as he had been in 18 B.C., when Agrippa had just become his colleague.

But Dio proceeds to declare that while the *lectio* was being conducted in this way, *αὐτὸς ἀπογραφὰς τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ κατοικούντων καὶ μὴ ἐλάττω πέντε μυριάδων οὐσίαν κεκτημένων ἐποιήσατο· τοὺς γὰρ ἀσθενεστέρους καὶ τοὺς ἔξω τῆς Ἰταλίας οἰκοῦντας οὐκ ἠνάγκασεν ἀπογράψασθαι, δείσας μὴ νεωτερίσωσί τι ταραχθέντες* (55, 14). If any such registration as Dio describes took place this year, it was obviously not in the nature of a census, but must have been some kind of *professio* of property, perhaps in connexion with some scheme for Italian taxation. But Dio, convinced that, when there was a *lectio*, there must be a census, finds what he wants in this *professio* required from the owners of property, and conscious of some difficulty, flounders into the following elucidation of the *obscurum* by the *obscurius*. *καὶ ὅπως μὴ δόξειεν ὡς τιμητὴς αὐτὸ ποιεῖν, . . . ἀνθύπατον ἐξουσίαν πρός τε τὸ τέλος τῶν ἀπογραφῶν καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ καθαρσίου ποίησιν προσέθετο.* All that can be said to emerge from this confusion and misapprehension is that Augustus held a *lectio senatus* in 4 A.D. and that he received some sort of formal authorization. Whether the impossible *ἀνθύπατον ἐξουσίαν* conceals the *consulare imperium* as granted in 8 B.C. and 14 A.D. must be left an open question.

We can now perhaps detect the scheme on which Augustus fitted his censorial activity. After the joint *lectio* and census of 28 B.C., called for no doubt by urgent public necessity, the census was to be held at regular intervals of twenty years, while between each two *lustra*, ten years after the one and before the other, a *lectio senatus* was to be inserted. Thus we have in 28 B.C. a census and *lectio*, in 18 B.C. a *lectio*, in 8 B.C. a census, in 4 A.D. (the date being a year late for reasons suggested above) a *lectio*. The scheme is completed by the census of 14 A.D., exactly ten years after the last *lectio*. Augustus himself records this census, and Suetonius refers to it; *lege per consules lata ut Tiberius communiter cum Augusto prouincias administraret simulque censum ageret* (*Tib.* 21). It was in 13 A.D. that the *imperium* of Augustus was renewed for

the last time (56, 28), and that the *tribunicia potestas* was continued to Tiberius, and it was almost certainly in the same year that the *censoria potestas* was in some form or other conferred on the latter. As we know that in the case of Augustus this was given under the special *consulare imperium*, we may with some safety assume that Tiberius also received the same *imperium*, and was thus, as Augustus calls him, his *collega*. No doubt, if Augustus had not been so anxious to obliterate the possibly painful memories which might still cling to his *lectiones*, he would have stated not only the dates, but the authorization or competence which he received for the task.[1]

E. G. HARDY.

PROFESSOR ELMORE'S HYPOTHESES.

ON those of Professor Elmore's hypotheses which appeared in his original article, I need make very few additional remarks. He restates them with undiminished confidence in this Review in January, 1918, but, except on one or two side issues, he makes no attempt to answer the careful and reasoned criticism to which I subjected them. The further developments of his theories, to which he calls my special attention, call for some examination, which however shall be brief.

1. The *recensus*.—(*a*) Professor Elmore declares that my view, which makes it something different from a mere population census, an enumeration pure and simple, departs from the tradition of the term. But the tradition of the term is to be found in a number of passages from the ancient authorities, very imperfectly cited by him, but fully discussed by me. As he ignores my interpretation of them, and admits that his own view puts a certain strain upon the meaning, I may leave the point, only noticing that the words '*usque ad recensum*' in the contract of sale must on the face of them refer to something different from a mere enumeration of heads.

(*b*) Was the *recensus* an enumeration of resident citizens or of *accipientes?* Suetonius gives the figure 320,000 as the total of the latter, and as the *recensus* was conducted *per dominos insularum*, we should naturally infer that it was limited to the class residing in *insulae*. But Professor Elmore has convinced himself that the *recensus* was a facsimile of the Egyptian κατ' οἰκίαν ἀπογραφή, and that all that is true of the one is true of the other. As the latter was a population census, so must the *recensus* have been, and, Suetonius notwithstanding, it must have been conducted by the owners of private as well as of tenement houses.

(*c*) I asked, who, if the *recensi* were all resident citizens, were the *non recensi?* Professor Elmore now tells us that they were those who, either accidentally or intentionally, had failed to have their names registered. There may have been such

[1] It has, I believe, been suggested that some distinctions may be drawn from the different expressions used by Dio for *senatum legere*. For 28 and 19 B.C. he uses ἐξήτασε, for 11 B.C. κατελέξατο, and for 4 A.D. διαλέξαι. But of these only the last is in any way unusual, and the novelty of the term is sufficiently discounted (*a*) by the word ἄθθις, which proves the process to be nothing new, and (*b*) by the term ἐξεταστὰς, which, being allied to the *triumuiratus legendi senatus*, brings the process into line with that of 28 and 18.

persons, but I do not agree with the suggestion that the new method of enumeration would make this class a large one. More probably it would, and was intended to, draw the net tighter. But, few or many, why, if the *recensus* was a mere population census, should these omitted persons not have been added at once to the citizen list, when discovered, instead of being admitted each year in driblets by means of a *subsortitio*?

2. The *professiones*.—Professor Elmore's hypothesis as to the *professi* of the Table and the nature of their *professio* depends absolutely on his identification of the *professiones* which Cicero was called upon to make in June 45 and May 44 with those provided for in the Table, and also on the assumption that the former were returns of property, which Cicero made in common with all owners of property in Rome. As this hypothesis is simply restated without any attempt to meet the objections brought against it in my previous article and in one contributed to the *J. R. S.* by Professor Reid, I need not notice it further, only calling attention to its most conspicuous weakness. The only words used by Cicero which can be taken to connect the *professiones* with property returns are in the second letter, where reference is made to one particular piece of property, which apparently need not have been registered at all.

3. The annual census.—But Professor Elmore not only restates without the smallest sign of misgiving his view of the *professiones*, but proceeds to develop further conclusions from it. As these are somewhat pointedly put forward as correctives to my lack of discernment, I can hardly leave them unnoticed. As we have seen, the *professiones* of the Table were property returns made by all owners domiciled in Rome. They were also annual, as inferred from the dates of Cicero's two letters, and from their connexion with the frumentations. Furthermore, as they must have been required for the sake of the information which they supplied, they were in effect census returns. Caesar indeed, we are told, intended to merge the old census in these new annual *professiones*. He did not however abolish the name, for in a later section of the Table (or, as Professor Elmore would say, of the law) it is provided that the authorities of Italian towns are to take a census of Roman citizens, whenever a census is held in Rome. The last words lead us a step further, for, as the census in Rome was annual, Caesar must have introduced an annual census for all Italy. This annual census is represented as almost the key-stone of Caesar's domestic policy, but its practical object, unless it was to give the local magistrates something to do, is not explained.

In examining this theory, I must risk, I fear, the imputation of being a literal-minded critic, for, where matters of detail are concerned, criticism which is not precise is useless.

1. If the *professiones* constituted a census, where is the censor, and how is it that they are made before a consul or a praetor or a tribune? We happen to know from the later section of the Table that the census at Rome was to be taken by the '*censor aliusue quis magistratus*.' This shows that the continued existence of the censor, though uncertain, was not yet prejudged. Is it conceivable that in the earlier section of the same law the census officials should be so fixed as to exclude the censor altogether? But Professor Elmore insists that the consuls, praetors and tribunes were always census officials, and that their mention here indicates that the *professiones* were census returns. The connexion of the consuls with censorial functions is familiar and need not detain us. As to the praetors and tribunes, Professor Elmore depends on a passage of Varro: *ubi praetores tribunique quique ad concionem uocati sunt uenerunt, censores inter se sortiuntur*" (*L.L.* 6, 87). I need only point out, (*a*) that the words afford no indication that the praetors and tribunes had any closer connexion with the census than the other persons summoned with them to the *concio*, and (*b*) that, even if they had some duties in connexion with the census, the passage

lends no support to the assumption that they could supply the censor's place in his absence.

2. It appears that the census returns as well as the names of those making them were to be posted up in the Forum so as to be legible to the public. Professor Elmore now admits in effect that this part of the scheme would have been unworkable, and naïvely complains that his theory would have been less assailable but for Caesar's indifference to administrative details, which, while himself laying down principles, he left to be worked out by careless or unpractical subordinates. But why, if they were census returns, should the *professiones* have been posted in the Forum at all? Is it seriously maintained that it was 'ingrained in Roman practice' for the censors to bring their lists to the public notice in this way?

3. The wording of the census section of the Table places it beyond doubt that the Italian census was to include all Roman citizens in the towns, or in other words, was to be, what the old census had always been, both a population and a property census. Not only was this for some unexplained reason to be taken every year, but its results were somehow to be incorporated with the returns of the annual census in the capital. But these returns were of property only, since the population census was quite distinct and not annual.[1] It would be interesting to learn in what way the consuls, praetors and tribunes were expected to handle these ill-assorted lists, and are we to attribute this disjointed scheme to Caesar or to his subordinates?

I notice that Professor Elmore still persists that without the annual returns of property it would have been impossible for the aediles to identify the house landlords liable for the repair of roads. It is enough to reply that the first property returns were made on his hypothesis in June 45, while the *recensus populi* took place in 46. If it was possible for purposes of the *recensus* to identify the '*domini insularum*' (and on his showing the owners of private houses also), it would have been equally possible for the aediles to identify house owners in connexion with the roads.

E. G. Hardy.

'LOMBARDIC.'

Ellis, in his *Prolegomena* to Catullus (pp. iv sqq., 1867), is at some pains to refute the opinion of J. J. Scaliger that the Archetype of our MSS. of Catullus was written in 'Lombardic' characters, and gives reasons—some of which require qualification—for presuming a 'Merovingian' original. He would have saved himself a good deal of trouble if he had stopped to ask what Scaliger meant by 'Lombardic.'

Mabillon, who first brought the term into general use, wrote more than a century after Scaliger; but he confesses that he could not find among scholars who had employed it before him any definition of its meaning (*De Re Diplomatica*, I. xi. p. 47 A-D; 1681). Salmasius had referred to the script as that 'quo plerique libri ueterum scripti reperiuntur'; and Scioppius had committed himself to the statement that 'ancient MSS. were very generally written in Lombardic' ('ueteres libros

[1] The Egyptian *ἀπογραφή* took place once in fourteen years. Professor Elmore does not say that this was the interval at Rome, but his treatment of the *non recensi* implies that the *recensus* recurred at infrequent intervals.

charactere passim Langobardico scriptos esse'). This was all that Mabillon could find in reputed works of scholarship.

Maffei long since pointed out that the Italian humanists had used the term 'Lombardic' as more or less synonymous with 'barbaric.' It was used of any difficult or untidy hand, and applied not only to Latin but also apparently to Greek writing. (Maffei states that Marcellus Vergilius spoke of a MS. of Dioscorides as being written 'langobardicis literis': but I have not been able to verify this.[1]) The term 'Gothic,' similarly, as applied to writing, was in origin merely a term of reproach. So too at a later date, for MSS. from beyond the Alps, the term 'Saxon.' The term 'Merovingian' was the creation of Mabillon himself. Scaliger, therefore, when he spoke of the 'Gallicanum exemplar' of Catullus as being written in 'Lombardic' letters was certainly not distinguishing 'Lombardic' from 'Merovingian.' Indeed, it seems likely that, if he had been shown a 'Merovingian' MS., he would have called it 'Lombardic.'

There is no quarrel, then, between Ellis and Scaliger, save in the fancy of Ellis. It may, however, be not uninstructive to show shortly, by the aid of the *Castigationes in Catullum*, what Scaliger conceived to be the distinguishing features of a 'Lombardic' script.

There are (or Scaliger thinks there are) four tests of this script. These are as follows:[2]

1. '*V* pro *A* scriptum fuit. Et Langobardus character non distinguit has duas literas:' p. 9; *similia*, pp. 14, 73, 77, 83.

2. 'In Langobardico charactere nihil omnino *T* differt a *C*:' p. 46; cf. pp. 21, 28, 32, 85, 98.

3. 'In Langobardicis literis nulla est omnino inter *I* et *L* differentia:' p. 70. So too p. 106, 'τοῦ *l* et *i* in Langobardicis literis nulla differentia est.'

4. In general a Lombardic MS. will contain indications of a great antiquity.[3]

These four tests Scaliger applies up and down his *Castigationes*, and has persuaded serious men like Ellis that he knew what he was talking about. I suspect that he would, as a fact, have been hard put to it to say whether 'Lombardic' writing was majuscule or minuscule. He speaks sometimes of *A* and *V*, *I* and *L*, sometimes of *a* and *u*, *i* and *l*, as being confused in this script; and he more than once illustrates the character of his 'Lombardic' original from a comparison with the Laurentian MS. of the *Pandects*, a MS. of saec. VI.-VII., written in the hand known to Renaissance scholars as *litera Pisana*, and called by Sir E. Maunde Thompson 'mixed uncial.'

H. W. Garrod.

[1] *Verona Illustrata*, I. ii., ch. XI., p. 549, Milan, 1825.

[2] My references are throughout to the pages of Scaliger's first edition (Paris, 1577).

[3] In this connection Scaliger calls attention to the fact that the Catullian Archetype confused the letters *C* and *G* (p. 86), *E* and *I* (pp. 67, 81, *al.*), *u* and *b* (p. 59), *X* and *C* (p. 105). *All* these confusions he regards as evidences of antiquity. So too such spellings as *loedere* (p. 15), *lucei* (p. 43), *rusum* (p. 58).

Comparing what is quoted above from Scioppius and Salmasius, it is obvious that the antiquity of the Lombardic script was a dogma of the time. The typical Beneventan hand is, in fact, not older than the typical Caroline hand.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. XXXIX. 2. 1918.

W. Petersen, *Syncretism in the Indo-European Dative* (concluded). The possessive and ethical datives and that of 'person judging' belong to the dative of advantage or disadvantage; and these with the dative of purpose (usually of abstract nouns) exhaust the usages of the 'primitive dative.' The locatival dative of the singular (suffix *-aị̯*, strong form of *-i*), when used to indicate the goal of motion, approximated to the primitive dative, which was fused with it as being a less clear form. The syncretism of the abl. dat. plural may be explained as due to the dative of separation (as with *adimo*), being treated as if it were an abl. Dative usages of 'composite origin' are considered and illustrated under the heads of datives connected closely or loosely with verbs, the dative of purpose, that with substantives and that with adjectives. A. C. Johnson, *Problems in Delphian Chronology*. Evidence available goes to show that between 279 and 268 Athens was under Macedonian domination. The lists of Delphian archons, etc., are scrutinized, reconstructed, and rearranged. C. W. Peppler, *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes* (Part IV.). Dealing with *-της*, various comic formations, including comic feminines and comparatives and superlatives. Clara M. Knight, *The* to- *Participle with the Accusative in Latin*. Argues that in pre-historic Italic the special function of the *to-* suffix was that of a participle of the middle (later the passive) voice. W. P. Mustard, *Later Echoes of the Greek Bucolic Poets* (in Neo-Latin pastoral poetry).

XXXIX. 3. 1918.

D. C. Stuart, *The Function and the Dramatic Value of the Recognition Scene in Greek Tragedy*. The three fundamental emotions to which dramatic art appeals, 'sympathy,' 'suspense,' and 'surprise,' are *apparently* not regarded in Aristotle's Poetics; but the established translations of ἔλεος 'pity' and φόβος 'fear' are not adequate, though 'sympathy' and 'suspense' do not exhaust the meaning of the Greek words. Neither Aristotle's classification of the different kinds of ἀναγνώρισις nor that of its critic, Professor Perrin, is satisfactory from a modern standpoint. The dénouements in the chief Greek tragedies, including that masterpiece, the *Oedipus Rex* of Sophocles, and their artistic employment of surprise, are considered in detail. E. W. Fay, *W. Germanic Preterites with* e² *from I.E.* ēi. E. W. Burlingame, *The Compound Negative Prefix* an-, a- *in Greek and Indic*. Considers that ἀνα- in ἀνάεδνος, ἀνάελπτος, ἀνάγνωστος, ἀνάπνευστος is a doubled emphatic negative, and compares Pali *anabhāva* 'utterly annihilated,' etc., and maintains that of the I.E. forms of the negative prefix only *ne* and *n* are represented in Greek. Tenney Frank, *Cicero* ad Att. XV. 9. 1. Would emend on the hypothesis that Cicero alludes in 'Lacedaemonem' to the proverb Σπάρτην ἔλαχες· ταύτην κόσμει.

Classical Philology. XIII. 3. 1918.

Tenney Frank, *The Economic Life of an Ancient City*. A description of the crafts and trades of Pompeii as represented in its buildings, remains, and inscriptions. C. F. Smith, *Personification in Thucydides*. Deals with πόλεμος, ναῦς, πόλις, φόβος (κόπος 7. 40. 4) and a number of abstracts. Lane Cooper, *The Fifth Form of Discovery in the* Poetics *of Aristotle*, criticizes Bywater's reading and interpretation of 1455a 12-16, taking συνθετή as a 'fictitious' discovery and reading ποιῆσαι παραλογισμόν. J. P. Postgate, *Textual Notes on Phaedrus*, emendations and suggestions on seventeen passages of the Fables. Keith Preston, *Aspects of Autumn in Roman Poetry*. The melancholy with which thoughts of autumn are tinged in modern poetry is to a certain extent traceable in the presentations in Roman poets with whom late autumn and early winter are not sharply distinguished. The shrivelling of the leaves was especially distasteful to them. Max Radin, *The Date of Composition of Caesar's* Gallic War. Rejecting the views that the Commentaries were composed as a whole at the same time and that they were written book by book, the writer adduces evidence to prove that they were written in three instalments: i.-ii. in the winter of 57-56, iii.-vi. in that of 53-52, and vii. in that of 52-51. Attention is drawn to the peculiar frequency of *oratio obliqua* in i. and ii. This may well have been a rhetorical experiment if Caesar was occupied on the *De Analogia* (as is probable) at the same time. R. B. Steele, *Some Features of the Later Histories of Alexander*. Collection of discrepancies and comments thereupon. Partisanship is manifest in the omissions and contradictions of previous writers, showing rivalry between the followers of Aristobulus (e.g. Arrian) and those of Clitarchus. Among Notes and Discussions Grace H. Macurdy explains ἀλέκτωρ 'cock' as 'averter of evil' (ἀλέξω), and N. W. de Witt develops the connexions of a Latin **licio* 'lead' or 'drive' with other words, *līcium*, *līmes*, *lictor*, etc.

XIII. 4. 1918.

A. Shewan, *Scheria—Corcyra*. Argues that the description of Phaeacia in Homer is based on reality, that a consistent ancient tradition identifies Scheria with Corfu, and that Scheria was an island and one not far from Ithaca nor very distant from Thesprotia. Champault's attempt to show against Bérard that Scheria is Ischia is a failure. W. B. McDaniel, *The* pupula duplex *and other tokens of the 'evil eye' in the light of opthalmology*. The 'double pupil' of e.g. Ov. *Am.* i. 8. 15 is not to be regarded, as Dr. Kirby F. Smith believes, as meaning a different colour of the two eyes or a bi-coloured iris, but as coloboma of the iris. The 'equi effigies' which according to Pliny, *N.H.* vii. 17 was found in the companion eye to the one with the 'double pupil' seems to be a case of the *membrana pupillaris perseuerans*. W. K. Prentice, *Sappho*. On the moral reputation of the poetess. F. E. Robbins, *The Cost to Athens of her Second Empire*. The sum total of naval and military expenditure for the period 378-369 was probably between 2500 and 3000 talents. Clinton C. Conrad, *The Rôle of the Cook in Plautus'* Curculio. Avoids the assumption of a lacuna after 273 by a reassignment of the speeches of the Cook and Palinurus in 274-279 and the next scene. Ira D. Hyskell, *Some Rare Meanings of* excludo. Seeks to establish the following developments from the sense 'force out.' I. 1. 'put out' (an eye), Plut. Ter.; 2. 'strike out' (a spark), Verg. Pliny; 3. possibly 'remove a gem from its setting, Digest. II. 1. 'to fashion by forcing out' 'hollow out' (a nest), Varro; 'fashion' (cells in a honeycomb), Verg.; 'carve out' (a statue), Solinus. 2 (fig.); 'compose' a book, Pliny *Ep.*; 'interpret' (a parable), Tertullian; 'give expression to,' Augustine. In Notes and Discussions P. Shorey suggests παρ' ἡμᾶς for περὶ ἡμᾶς in Diog. Laert. ix. 108.

Classical Weekly (New York). 1918.

Oct. 7. F. H. Cowles, *Gaius Verres;* an historical study (W. D. Gray). A systematic attempt to present in complete form the sum total of the evidence covered by the Verrine indictment.

Oct. 14. W. Aly, *Hesiods Theogonie* mit Einleitung und kurzem Kommentar versehen (G. M. Bolling). An interesting and well constructed edition.

Oct. 21. R. H. Lacey, *The Equestrian Officials of Trajan and Hadrian*: their careers, with some notes on Hadrian's reforms (W. A. Oldfather). A precise and elaborately documented study, well planned and methodically executed. Two excellent indices make every significant fact easily accessible.

Oct. 28. G. H. Chase, *Catalogue of Arretine Pottery* (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) (J. G. Winter). The Introduction is the best article on this important class of vases that has yet appeared.

Nov. 11. E. H. Brewster, *Roman Craftsmen and Tradesmen of the Early Empire* (F. W. Wright). The material for this dissertation is largely drawn from the satirists and from Petronius and Martial.

Mnemosyne. XLVI. 4.

J. J. Hartman contributes an appreciation of Ovid's story of Ceyx and Alcyone (*Metam.* XI. 410-748), appending some criticisms of the text. W. Vollgraff continues his notes on Sophocles, *Antigone*. P. H. Damsté contributes three articles containing critical notes on the *Thyestes*, *Medea*, and *Hercules Furens* of Seneca. J. van Wageningen, *The Four 'Temperaments.'* Investigates the origin of the medieval theory of temperaments or humours. Aristotle was the first to lay down that the dispositions of men depend on the state of the 'atra bilis' in their bodies. The Stoics held that the varieties of human character are due to the various admixtures of the four elements, and this theory was further developed by Galen. The names *choleric*, *sanguine*, *melancholic*, and *phlegmatic* were introduced by Iohannitius, an Arab (Honein ben Ishak, A.D. 809-873), and brought into general use by Honorius of Autun in the twelfth century. H. D. Verdam, *Quo tempore* Phaedrus *Platonicus scriptus sit*, criticizes two works of von Arnim. In the former of these, *Sprachliche Forschungen zur Chronologie der platonischen Dialoge*, von A. applies a statistical method to elucidate the order of the Platonic dialogues, and in the latter, *Plato's Jugenddialoge und die Entstehungszeit der* Phaidros (1914), he seeks to show that the statistical method is confirmed by an analysis of the arguments of the dialogues. Verdam, limiting himself to the latter method of investigation, applies it to the *Phaedo*, the *Republic*, and the *Phaedrus*. He concludes that the *Phaedrus* was composed between the *Phaedo* and the *Republic*. W. Vollgraff, *De Lege collegii cantorum Milesii*, gives the text, with a translation and notes, of an inscription found at Miletus, and first edited by Wilamowitz in 1904. The law was promulgated B.C. 450-449. The 'college of singers' was a self-governing institution, consisting of worshippers of Apollo. Almost every Milesian citizen was eligible for membership. In illustration of its general character he quotes J. A. K. Thomson, *The Greek Tradition:* 'The earliest poetry is . . . a form of charm or spell . . . the accompaniment of a magical dance. . . . The dance is performed by the entire community or "tribe" of able and qualified dancers. Hence poetry is in its beginning choral.' F. Muller, *The Origin of the Future Participle in Latin*, derives it from the supine + *īre*, e.g. *factum ire*, which became *factūre*, the original form of the future infinitive. From this, on the analogy of the past participle (e.g. *factus*, *-a*, *-um*), was formed the future participle (*facturus*, *-a*, *-um*). He discusses the problem of anomalous future participles (*moriturus*, etc.) and desideratives (*esurio*, etc.). J. J. Hartman contributes some critical notes on Pindar. There are also short notes on Hor. *Od.* III. 29, 62-64; III. 24, 58; IV. 4, 68; Pindar, *Ol.* XIII. 53; Gellius II. 21, 8.

Revue de Philologie. XLII. 1. 1918.

Ragnar Ullmann, *Essai sur le* Catilina *de Salluste.* A discussion of Sallust's originality as a literary artist. Maintains the view that he sought some of his principles of composition in the Greek drama. L. Saint-Paul, *Notes sur l'inscription d'Abercius.* The inscription belongs to the early years of the third century. Lines 11-12 should be read *πάντη δ' ἔσχον συνομίλους | Παῦλον ἔχων ἐπ' ὄχων πίστις πάντη δὲ προῆγε.* Abercius takes the epistles of St. Paul with him on his travels as a proof of his orthodoxy. J. E. Harry, *Emendations to the Greek tragic poets.* P. Collart, *Homère et Bacchylide dans les papyrus d'Oxyrhynchos.* F. Préchac, *Un fragment de critique d'art dans Suidas.* *Σεβαστιανός* mentioned in Suidas' article s.v. refers to the Colossus of Nero, and not to the general who is the subject of the article. The passage in which it occurs is a marginal note by some reader. P. Foucart, Aristotle, Πολ. Ἀθ. 62. 2. P. Foucart, *Un héros Ephésien.* On Heropythos a citizen of Ephesus, on whom the title and cult of a *ἥρως* was bestowed. F. Cumont, *Écrits hermétiques.* 1. Sur les douze lieux de la sphère (to be continued). *Revue des Comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique.* Contains bibliography of works published in 1914.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1918.

(*All issues are now double numbers.*)

July 8. A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriechische Bühne* (Dörpfeld). I. H. Lehner, *Das Provinzialmuseum in Bonn.* II. Die römischen und fränkischen Skulpturen (Ziehen). Modest and thorough.

July 22. P. Kägi, *Nachwirkungen der älteren griechischen Elegie in den Epigrammen der Anthologie* (Preisendanz). A useful collection. P. Lehmann, *Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz.* I. Die Bistümer Konstanz und Chur. (Manitius). A task completed.

Aug. 5. A. Frickenhaus, *Die altgriechische Bühne* (Dörpfeld). II. The reviewer disputes the writer's views as to the Ekkyklema and the wooden parts of the ancient Greek and the Hellenistic proskenion. H. Niedermayer, *Über antike Protokollliteratur* (Koch). F. Oelmann, *Die Keramik des Kastells Niederbieber*, and W. Unversagt, *Die Keramik des Kastells Alzei* (H. Lamer).

Sept. 2. M. Leumann, *Die lateinischen Adjectiva auf* -lis (Sonnenburg). H. Mutschmann, *Zur Datierung des platonischen* Lysis. 'The *Lysis* belongs to Plato's earliest writings, for the rhetor Polycrates used it in his *κατηγορία Σωκράτους*' (Xen. *Mem.* I. 2. 51 sq., and Liban V. p. 70, Foerster).

Sept. 16. Otto Apelt, *Platons Dialoge* Hippias I. II., Ion, Alcibiades I. II. Translated and explained by O. A. (Gillischewski). Very helpful.

Sept. 30. Pauly, *Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft.* New edition by Wissowa-Kroll. Nineteenth half-volume; 'Jugurtha'—'Jus Latii' (Harder). G. Rasner, *Grammatica Propertiana ad fidem codicum retractata* (Köhm). Treats only of the accidence, but with care and completeness.

Oct. 20. G. Körte, *Göttinger Bronzen* (Koepp). A beautiful production. C. Weyman, *Similia zu Vergil's Hirtengedichten.* Deals with the fifth *Eclogue.* A. Trendelenburg, *Zur vierten Römerode des Horaz.* An analysis of the contents.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL, 1919.

THE SCHERIA OF THE *ODYSSEY*.

II.

I NOW turn to an examination of the grounds for arguing supernaturalism in the Phaeacian story, but for their proper appreciation it is necessary to consider an element in the narrative which unfortunately has had little attention of recent years. There is in it more than mere unseasoned description. The poet is evidently taking off these settlers in Scheria, the centre about which his humour plays being the figure of their king, Alkinoos. This is no new thing, but all, as Blass once slily remarked of a scene in the *Iliad*, do not perceive it. It was clear to Mure. On pp. 404 sqq. of Vol. I. of his *Hist. of Gk. Lit.* he describes the fun at length, deplores the misapprehension by 'profound commentators,' and thinks the episode 'the most brilliant specimen of the poet's combined talent for the delineation of character and for satirical humour.' See also Samuel Butler's *The Humour of Homer*. No one was better qualified than Butler for such an appreciation; the pity is that he spoiled it all by his great Homeric joke about Nausikaa's authorship. Some points are noticed by Perrin and Hayman, and Trenkel sees that the community is *Gegenstand des Spottes*. But generally the humour is lost on the commentators, who, intent only on the jigsawing of the Phaeacian story, mark the *uerborum minutiae* and are blind to the *rerum pondera*.

Alkinoos appears to be a hearty old sea-dog, well-to-do, and proud of his prosperous people. His speeches show him vain and egotistical. This is apparent from the recurrence in them of ἐγώ and its parts and derivatives, and from his references to the ἀρετή of his Phaeacians, who are to him ἀμύμονες and 'excel all others.' 'Self-laudatory bombast,' Mure says, is the chief characteristic of his discourses. He is also impulsive and downright, promising convoy to the stranger—who might, λ 363 sqq., have been ἠπεροπεὺς καὶ ἐπίκλοπος!—after an hour's acquaintance, and even suggesting that he should take Nausikaa to wife. He seems to be of a simple mind—ἁπλοϊκὸς μάλιστα εἰσάγεται, schol. η 313—and apt to be careless as to the discharge of his public duties, η 159 sqq., and λ 346. In the latter case, when called to order,

he is alert at once, and is ready to comply if Heaven give him one more day to live.

And he is fond of the feast and loves *οἴνῳ πνεύμονα τέγγειν*. This helps to explain his speeches. His own daughter's words, when he is first introduced, are surely significant, *τῷ* (*θρόνῳ*) *ὅ γε οἰνοποτάζει ἐφήμενος ἀθάνατος ὥς*—as if draining the winecup were his habitual occupation and *τὸ πίνειν τὸ ζῆν*. Trenkel goes so far as to attribute to him the *Stimmung einer seligen Zechers*. Some critics might have saved themselves trouble over discrepancies had they noticed that the speeches which they were dissecting were made by the king when the wine was in. Thus in *η* he and his nobles are introduced to us at dinner, *πίνοντες καὶ ἔδοντες*, and it is just after the company has broken up that he makes the proposal of marriage already mentioned, with a suddenness which surprises Nitzsch. Yet further experience of the king's way after a good meal makes it clear that he sometimes in such circumstances *ἔπος προέηκεν ὅ πέρ τ' ἄρρητον ἄμεινον*. These circumstances recur the very next day. At the banquet the minstrel's song moves Odysseus to tears, and Alkinoos, noticing this, proposes an adjournment for games, but is unfortunately led on to swagger about the prowess of his performers—*ἦ τοίνυν τοῦτο ἀλαζονέύεται*, Eustath. *a.l.* His guest shall see them and be able to proclaim to his friends, *ὅσσον περιγιγνόμεθ' ἄλλων | πύξ τε παλαισμοσύνῃ τε καὶ ἅλμασιν ἠδὲ πόδεσσιν*, *θ* 102 sq. The games proceed, and there are displays in all the four sports mentioned, the victor in boxing being his own son Laodamas. Next comes the interlude in which Odysseus, displeased at the challenge from Laodamas[1] and roused by the insulting words of another performer, hurls a discus in a style that astonishes the assemblage. He then, in the heat of victory, offers to engage all comers in *any* contest, excepting only running, for which, after his experiences in the sea, he does not feel very fit. The effect of this is to sober Alkinoos at once. He must prevent the stranger from shaming them all, especially after his own boast, so he makes an apology for the rudeness, and then in the silliest manner possible and still with a vanity that refuses to be suppressed, makes a complete change of front. The stranger is carefully to mark the king's words, so that—once again—he may be able to tell of the *ἀρετή* of the Phaeacians, and is now to hear the true manner of it. They are not, in this revised version, *πύγμαχοι* at all! They love the feast and dance and other luxuries. But above all they excel in the dance. Odysseus shall see for himself, and—yet again—tell his friends how the Phaeacians 'beat everybody' *ναυτιλίῃ καὶ ποσσὶ καὶ ὀρχηστυῖ καὶ ἀοιδῇ*. One notes especially the *ποσσί*. It is the only reference to athletics, and is the one contest in which Odysseus had said he would *not* compete, and which his host was quite safe in mentioning. He falls back on music and the dance

[1] I have not seen a reason suggested for Laodamas' behaviour. Is it that he was sore at having had to give up his place of honour by his father the night before? If so, there is a parallel given by Wägner-Anson, *Epics and Romances of the Middle Ages*, 21. Similarly, the apology for the insult and the amende by the gift of a sword are paralleled, *ibid.* 353, in Beowulf.

and his ships, and there he is on firm ground. His explanation involves a self-contradiction which has offended the critics. See for a recent statement on the point Mr. Paton in *C.R.* XXVI. 215 sq. The argument there takes no account of the character in which the poet presents Alkinoos. He notices, I may add, the standing difficulty of ὥς κεν . . . ἐκτελέσειεν ἀέθλους πολλούς in θ 22 sq. If it is not resolved by Merry and Riddell *a.l.*—the discus was Odysseus' 'discharge in full'—see the subsequent lines 146 sqq., 154, 184, and especially 205 sqq.

The narrative proceeds. Demodocus sings the famous Lay, on which the critics have expended so much adverse comment, and which Mr. Paton vindicates as old and genuine. There is then an exhibition of dancing and ball-play *à deux*, which moves Odysseus to a warm compliment. The effect on Alkinoos is instantaneous. 'With ravish'd ears the monarch hears.' His vanity is pleased, he has disposed of a dangerous performer, and he turns with childish delight to his audience. The stranger is really a man of sense—μάλα μοι δοκέει πεπνυμένος εἶναι—and able to appreciate outstanding ἀρετή! Such solid discernment must not go unrewarded, so the nobles are ordered each to present Odysseus with fine raiment and a talent of gold. Alkinoos includes himself, and Butler will have it that in the event the king, whom he unreasonably describes as 'out at elbows,' conveniently forgets his own money contribution. He appears, however, to contribute a golden cup in substitution.

Later there is more feasting, but Alkinoos does not get another opportunity for distinguishing himself till Odysseus' tears once more compel his attention as *rex conuiuii*. There is first the extraordinary praise of his ships. That will be considered presently. Eustathius was right when he said οὕτω πάνυ τολμᾷ ὁ Ὁμηρικὸς Ἀλκίνοος τερατεύεσθαι. But the further claim that his ships sail the sea in perfect safety leads to a delicious ending to the digression. As he boasts, he suddenly remembers an old saying of his father's that the Phaeacians' weakness for conveying strangers would get them into trouble yet, and that one day a ship so engaged would be wrecked by Poseidon, who would also in his wrath surround the city with a mountain. We expect the usual formula of pious deprecation of an evil chance, such as μὴ τοῦτο θεὸς τελέσειε or μὴ τοῦτο φίλον Διὶ πατρὶ γένοιτο. Not so from Alkinoos in his exalted mood, but τὰ δέ κεν θεὸς ἢ τελέσειεν, | ἤ κ' ἀτέλεστ' εἴη, ὥς οἱ φίλον ἔπλετο θυμῷ. So the devil may take the future; we 'take the good the gods provide.' Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof. For the present let them enjoy themselves, and Alkinoos resumes his inquiries of the stranger with a quiet mind. The whole scene is consistent, but it has caused much heart-burning. Even Bérard would cut out the passage as *bavardage insupportable*. *Bavardage* it is, but just what we expect from the king when warmed by good cheer. Nitzsch's *heitere Prahler* is a quite appropriate description.

The king is evidently the chief butt of the humour of the poet when setting himself to make fun of the society as a whole—the ladies, however, excepted. Mure goes so far as to say the women 'engross the small stock of

common sense allotted to the community,' and certainly those brought on the stage seem to be intended as foils to the male actors. Areté is a noble figure, and Nausikaa, by common consent, one of the most charming and lovable figures in all literature. But, apart from the presentation of Alkinoos, there are numerous touches which indicate a spirit of irony. The athletic exhibition of this easy-going community of sailors is described almost as seriously as the Ἆθλα of the *Iliad*.[1] The poet obviously repeats his own phraseology. He even exceeds it when he applies to the wrestler Euryalus the epithet *βροτολοιγῷ ἶσος Ἄρηϊ*! When he says of the same athlete, *ἄριστος ἔην εἶδός τε δέμας τε πάντων Φαιήκων μετ' ἀμύμονα Λαοδάμαντα*, we can hardly fail to recall the comparison between two somewhat greater heroes, Achilles and Aias. Pointed again is the effect of Odysseus' throw on the crowd of Phaeacians. As the discus hurtles through the air, they crouch to the ground, not because the discus comes near them, but apparently alarmed by the mere noise—*λαὸς ὑπὸ ῥιπῆς*—and awestruck by the performance of a real *ἀθλητήρ*, and the poet seizes the occasion, when the wind, so to speak, has been taken out of the Phaeacian sails, to give them their full high-sounding style and title of *Φαίηκες δολιχήρετμοι, ναυσίκλυτοι ἄνδρες*. All the preparations for the *pièce de résistance*, the dance brought on after the *éclat* of the athletic performance had been sadly marred by that horrid discus, are conceived in the same vein. The line, *αἰσυμνῆται δὲ κριτοὶ ἐννέα πάντες ἀνέσταν*,[2] recalls the similar one in the *Iliad* telling how the Achaean chiefs rose to accept Hector's challenge; the preparation of the *χόρος*, the marking off of the lists in Γ 315; while the ball thrown about in the dance is duly ascribed to its maker, like the great shield of Aias, or the chair of state, *δινωτὴ ἐλέφαντι καὶ ἀργύρῳ*, in which Penelopé was wont to sit. But this their own pet display, the last infirmity of the noble Phaeacians, has a grace of its own and extorts the praise of Odysseus. The effect of the praise on the jolly monarch has already been noted. His is a temperament easily affected. There is satire in his name—the 'Strong of Intellect' (Mure), or 'Prowess-minded' (Perrin). But it should be noted that those of the supernaturalists who equate Phaeacia with the *Unterwelt* think it a splendid name for a stern lord of the infernal regions. Osterwald's *Starkherz* is yet another name for him who even in antiquity was *Κρόνου πολυώνυμος υἱός*.

The conclusion that the poet is, in Butler's phrase, quietly laughing in his sleeve, is not to be resisted. The motive underlying the delicate pasquinade we shall never know with certainty, but the fact has to be borne in mind in all interpretations of the *Phäakis* and inferences from its language. That the quiet raillery has been so seldom detected is due to the fact that criticism has been obsessed by the supernatural prejudice, and by the *Modekrankheit*, which left no room for appreciation of the poet's aims, that the episode is a patch-

[1] Jobst in a *Program*, Passau, 1909, compares the two Tournaments. After excising in each case what he deems spurious, he finds much that is common to the two narratives.

[2] I should now take stronger ground than I did in *C.Q.* VII. 234 sqq. in regard to some of the cases relied on by Monro.

work of the remains of a number of poems or stories of different ages. That idea originated, and was mainly pursued, in Germany, 'dem klassischen Lande,' to use Rothe's expression, 'der philologischen Zergliederungen.' If any section of the epics is a finely finished whole, it is this delightful tale of the stay of Odysseus in Scheria. And yet the hash that has been made of it! The process still goes on—*insano iuuat indulgere labori*, in spite of the discouragement such principles have received even in the land of their birth. But to give an account of the dissection of the *Phäakis* is beyond my scope. I can only, with Miss Stawell, *op. cit.* 141 sqq., pay to such sacrilege the tribute of a sigh—in Pindar's words, *τυφλὸν δ' ἔχει ἦτορ ὅμιλος ἀνδρῶν ὁ πλεῖστος.*

Let us now consider the grounds for the various fairyland theories. The first reason is that the Phaeacians have a close connexion with the gods. They are *ἀγχίθεοι* in the repeated line ϵ 35=τ 279. Further, in η 205 sqq., Alkinoos, speaking after dinner, and 'at his best,' tells Odysseus that they are accustomed to divine appearances at sacrifice, and even to meeting gods in bodily form. In the latter case the gods *οὔ τι κατακρύπτουσιν, ἐπεί σφισιν ἐγγύθεν εἰμέν*, like the Cyclopes or those wild beings, the Gigantes. On these two words, *ἀρχίθεοι*[1] and *ἐγγύθεν*, see the note of Merry and Riddell on η 205, which gives the gist of the matter. And I find the commentators generally take both expressions as 'nearly related to the gods,' which the Phaeacians, including their royal family, certainly were by their descent from Poseidon. But in that there is nothing unusual. The alternative view, taking *ἐγγύθεν* in a local sense, is that the Phaeacians are among 'those distant nations who seemed to dwell on the confines of the world and are special favourites of the gods.' Cp. Nitzsch on η 201 sqq. But even this suits the people of Corcyra. The island is not mentioned in the *Catalogue*. It was to Homer outside the Achaean world, like the blameless Aethiopians and the good Abioi. There is no need to press *ἐγγύθεν* to mean that the Phaeacians are near the gods in the sense of inhabiting a non-terrestrial *νῆσος μακάρων*. *ἀντίθεοι*, once applied to them, is too common an epithet to require remark, and *ἀνθρώποισι διοτρεφέεσσι*, ϵ 378, in Poseidon's mouth, is probably not to be taken of the Phaeacians alone. Rather, the god is contemplating Odysseus' arrival among *ἄνθρωποι* proper, after his experience of such savages as the Cyclopes and Laestrygones. Confining it to the Phaeacians, Merry and Riddell compare *δῖοι Ἀχαιοί* or *Πελασγοί*. As to the intimate intercourse claimed by Alkinoos, that, even if it be taken seriously, is no strange thing in Greek literature, and especially in Greek epic. In the Odyssey itself, ρ 483 sqq., we have it stated that the gods wander about the earth. In Pylos, Athené *ἐναργὴς ἦλθε θεοῦ ἐς δαῖτα θάλειαν*, γ 420, 375 sqq., and at Troy Diomede, Z 128, seems to regard a theophany as nothing out of the common. π 161 implies that the gods appear to selected individuals or classes. Taken at its face value, Alkinoos' utterance does not

[1] The only other occurrence of the word in the early epic seems to be *Hymn. Ven.* 200. Its use there gives no support to the fairyists' argument. With this passage Nitzsch, on ϵ 35, quotes from Plato, *Πρίαμον ἐγγὺς θεῶν γεγονότα.*

exceed what the ancients believed about their remote ancestors. See a plain statement in Pausanias, VIII. 2, 4, and another in Hesiod, *Fragm.* 82 Rzach, and some good remarks by Nägelsbach, *op. cit.* 144 sqq.

But the unearthly nature of the Phaeacians is also evidenced by their passenger traffic. They convey home all strangers who come to them. Worse still, they convey them in their (of course the strangers') sleep, though, be it observed, we hear of only *one* case of the kind, that of Odysseus. And, worst of all, they transport their visitors in magic ships.

Their general disposition to help strangers can hardly be considered in itself very strong evidence of the supernatural. The Phaeacians are not the only *φιλόξεινοι* people in the poem, and *πομπή* is quite a familiar transaction, as *γ* 325, *ι* 518, *κ* 18, *ο* 80 sqq. On the other hand, if Scheria be Corcyra, the half-way house between Achaeis and the west, the appropriateness of the attribution is evident.

But Odysseus is conveyed in a sleep described as *νήγρετος ἥδιστος, θανάτῳ ἄγχιστα ἐοικώς*. The critic on the look out for 'copy' fastens on the mention of death, and at once evolves a theory. I pass the argument that to Homer, Ξ 231, Π 672, as to the English poet, Sleep is Death's twin brother, and that the comparison need not surprise us. Let us rather examine the circumstances. If ever a man earned sound sleep for three, or thrice three, nights in succession, it was Odysseus on this occasion. He had been thrown up on the coast after many days and nights of unceasing physical effort, and had then passed a night on a bed of leaves in the open. He has then two comfortable nights in Alkinoos' palace, but during the third he has to tell a long story, and certainly spends most of it talking hard. Surely then it is not unnatural for him to sleep a sound sleep, a very *χάλκεον ὕπνον*, on his voyage the following night. And there is no divine intervention, no *Zauber*. On the contrary, the sleep is anticipated as a matter of course by all concerned. See *η* 318 sq. and *θ* 445. The *πομπῆες* make up a bed for Odysseus in the stern-sheets, *ν* 70 sqq., *ἵνα νήγρετος εὕδοι*. More reasonable than the critics, they felt arrears of sleep were due their passenger, and he was given them. *ἀτρέμας εὗδε, ν* 92—*wie ein kind*, as Preller-Robert put it. And he does not die, but wakes in Ithaka, refreshed and vigorous for the *ἄεθλος ἀάατος* before him. Surely this notion of Phaeacian daemons conveying the hero as mere *κωφὴ γαῖα*, an *Οὖτις* before his time, is as ill founded as any of the speculations about Scheria. The beauty of the scene *ν* 70-92 I suppose I must not appeal to. It has always appeared to me to be as perfect and as impressive a piece of description as is to be found in the poems, and I have been astonished to note how seldom that attracts the critic's attention. Groeger, *l.c.*, stresses the appropriateness of the *langentbehrten Schlummer*, and Hahn, *Stimmungen bei Homer*, 5, warmly praises the *unvergleichlichen Zug*, but generally the beauty of the conception, the perfect peace in which the sorely-tried wanderer reaches his native shore, remains unmarked.

The magic ships would be a stronger element in the case, if they could be

taken seriously. The argument is based on the king's words in θ 555 sqq. The critics, with justice, find the whole speech lengthy, rambling and contradictory. Well, the occasion is festal, and the culminating point in the festivities has been reached. Alkinoos is in splendid form, for everything conspires to make him indulge his propensity for laudation of his people. This penchant has not long before, as we have seen, led him to a nasty fall, and we feel he must be more careful in future. But he is not. One universal proverb says, 'when the wine is in, the wit is out,' and another that 'there is no fool like an old fool.' All is unexceptionable till the king comes to the promise of a safe passage. The opportunity is irresistible. At the mention of his ships he goes off at a tangent, as the saying is, and utters a prolonged vaunt. Is it necessary or natural to take this as an assertion of matter of fact? How is it even possible? The Phaeacian king and people are described by the poet as ordinary mortal men like Odysseus himself. How are we to reconcile with that the possession of magic ships, self-propelling, endowed with intelligence, and—the earliest known use of naval camouflage—invisible? How are we to reconcile the perfect immunity from sea-risks claimed for the ships, with the distinct danger, which the king in his thoughtlessness actually discloses to his guest, from the displeasure of Poseidon? And how are we to reconcile the bombastic enumeration of wonderful attributes with the subsequent account of the voyage and the preparations for it, which is just what the poet gives us of other trips by merely mortal vessels? See e.g. ν 22, 78, 113-5, which show the ship selected was navigated by ordinary methods—as we should expect from more general references, e.g. θ 50 sqq., η 319 (Alkinoos himself), and ζ 268 sqq. Athené praises, η 34 sqq., the speed of the ships, and the poet himself their owners' seamanship. The king's extravagant description is mere braggadocio—*πάνυ τερατωδέστερον*, Eustath., *καυχᾶται λέγων*, schol.—and quite in keeping with his Homeric character. His pride in his ships overleaps itself so far as to compare them to sentient beings, so well do they answer the demands of their crews.

But such fondly exaggerated descriptions are not uncommon in the mouths of those who own ships and go down to the sea in them, and are imbued with a love for the craft in which they live much of their lives. Take, for instance, the enthusiastic eulogy of the 'Falcon' in *The China Clipper*, p. 21. If she had been a living being, we are told, the sympathy of the appreciative crew could not have been livelier. They recognized how she rebelled at over-pressure, or sulked or was offended at neglect. '"She can do everything but speak," was a common remark among the crew.' Had they been proposing her health, after a good dinner, like Alkinoos, they might like him have gone a good deal further. Hennings, *Odyssee*, 258, gives a similar reference to a modern story in which it is said of a steamer, the pet of its owner no doubt, *Man fühlt, dass die Menschen diesem gebrechlichen Dinge eine mutige Seele, einen verständigen Willen verliehen haben . . . es ist ein menschlicher Organismus*, etc. In Jack London's novel, *Adventure*, his heroine speaks of her

favourite schooner as a 'witch,' a 'fairy.' Bérard, I. 488, observes that men of the sea are given to exaggerating to landsmen—beings of an inferior kidney, for 'home-keeping youths have ever homely wits.' Phaeacian ships had, he notes, fifty-two[1] rowers instead of the Achaean twenty. Their speed would be something for the men of the south to speak of and to magnify. It would appear to them, as Ukert says, *Geogr.* 25, *übernatürlich.* Bérard tells us how big British naval craft struck the local nautical mind in the Mediterranean on their first appearance there. A Turkish captain told of one warship that could go from Constantinople to Cairo in a day. It is a good parallel to Alkinoos and his Scheria-Euboea feat, and it was not, apparently, told at a complimentary banquet, when man turns so lightly to flights of fancy in which all his geese are swans.

But we are not done with θ 550 sqq. yet. To my thinking it is genuine, as being in perfect keeping with the character of Alkinoos. But this much has to be observed. It is the mainstay of the fairyland theory, and that theory is accepted by the great majority of the critics who have dissected the episode. Now, if there is one passage in it in regard to the spuriousness of which they are agreed, it is this one. Cut it out then, to please them, and one can cheerfully concede to them all that makes for *Märchen* in the other grounds adduced.

Next, we take the gold and silver κύνες[2] at the entrance to the palace. If you endow these with life, you are out of the world of sense at once. But even in the abode of the gods such marvels are notably rare—Dr. Leaf on Σ 376. Here there is no reason to suppose they were more than images, ἔργα ζωοῖσιν ὁμοῖα, as Pindar, *Olymp.* VII. 52 sq., expresses it. See Merry and Riddell, *a.l.* The animals show no sign of life. We cannot force φυλασσέμεναι. The scholiasts' ὥστε δοκεῖν φυλάσσειν is enough. And, as someone has pertinently remarked, if the κύνες were alive, they might at least have given a bark or a growl when Odysseus approached. It is no answer to say the hero was enveloped in mist. If a mortal dog can recognize an immortal god, as in π 162 sq., an immortal hound, ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήραος, and expressly set for watch and ward, could surely expose a stranger sneaking past him. They were only dumb metal. All the life they have is given them by the vividness which Gladstone found in the poet's word-picture of the famous περόνη in τ 226 sqq. In both cases we are presented with a triumph of art, and the language used is in the vein familiar from Martial's 'piscis adspicis, adde aquam natabunt.'

Again some capital has been made out of the reference to Rhadamanthys in η 321 sqq. Alkinoos is speaking, and his remarks read like brag. See

[1] The coincidence with the number of weeks in a year has not been lost on supernaturalists. See Osterwald *op. cit.* 92, and cp. for other *Zahlenspielen* of the kind, *ibid.* 87, and Fick, *Entstehung d. Od.* 190 sqq. To those who believe the poet means no more than what he says, it seems simple to take a crew of fifty, with the ἀρχὸς ναυτάων and κυβερνητήρ. Vürtheim, *De Aiacis origine*, 64, divides 52 by 13, the number of the Phaeacian βασιλεῖς, and gets 4, the number of φυλαί—*systema igitur Ionicum.* This is hard to follow.

[2] I might repeat, in regard to the attitude of the Higher Criticism to the description of Alkinoos' palace and gardens, what I have just said about θ 550 sqq.

what they lead up to in the last two lines of the speech—*εἰδήσεις δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ὅσσον ἄρισται | νῆες ἐμαί*—note the emphatic possessive—*καὶ κοῦροι*. The mention of Rhadamanthys comes about thus. The king assures Odysseus he shall be taken home, even if his destination be further away than Euboea, furthest of all lands, at least so said certain Phaeacians who were there *ὅτε τε ξανθὸν Ῥαδάμανθυν | ἦγον ἐποψόμενον Τιτυόν, Γαιήϊον υἱόν*. The fast Phaeacian cruisers went there and back on that occasion *ἄτερ καμάτοιο, ἤματι τῷ αὐτῷ*. And that is all.

Commentators have frankly given up the puzzle as to the reason for the visit to the monstrous son of Gaia. Eustathius suggested it was either simply to visit him, or to marvel at his size, *ἢ καὶ ἵνα δίκαιος ὢν σωφρονίσῃ αὐτόν*! And they similarly despair of discovering what Rhadamanthys was doing in Scheria. What they argue from the passage is this. From δ 563 sq. (Proteus to Menelaus) it appears he was on the Elysian Plain. Therefore Scheria was in the neighbourhood of Elysium, and not, or hardly, terrestrial. This was the view of Welcker, against whom are Nitzsch, on η 316 sqq., and Rohde, *Psyche*, 71, 75 and notes, and others. It involves the assumption that Rhadamanthys was on the Plain when the Phaeacians conveyed him, but that is by no means certain.

The first question that arises is, who was this Rhadamanthys? It is generally taken for granted that he was a Cretan, and brother of Minos. In Ξ 321 sq. he and Minos are among the many illegitimate sons of Zeus, their mother being the daughter of Phoinix afterwards known to legend as Europa. Elsewhere in the poems Rhadamanthys is mentioned only in the two passages of the *Odyssey* quoted above, and in each of these he is *ξανθός*. Is he then the Rhadamanthys of the *Iliad?* In Ξ the poet might have said *τε ἰδὲ ξανθὸν Ῥαδάμανθυν*, but we cannot argue solely from the different epithet that he meant to indicate a different person. But surely a Rhadamanthys who is *ξανθός* like Menelaus and other mainland heroes, cannot have been a Minoan?[1] And I find that doubts have been entertained as to his Cretan origin, and whether there were not two of the name.[2] See Grote, *History*, edition of 1888, I. part i. 210, quoting Ephorus and Aristotle, Friedreich, *Realien*, 519, and Roscher, s.v. *Rhadamanthys*, 78. Bethe, *Minos*, in *Rhein. Mus.* N.F. LXV., denies his connexion with Crete, and says he came to be brother to Minos only because in Boeotia he had been made a son of Europa. Cp. Roscher, *l.c.* 77. Radermacher, *Das Jenseits*, 98, thinks he belongs to Elysium. As Crete was *μακάρων νῆσος*, his transfer thither would easily be made. In fact the authorities are not at all clear about Rhamanthys. His name remains a puzzle. See Roscher, *l.c.* 85 sq., and add Fick, *Personennamen*,[2] 432, and Lewy, *Semit. Fremdwörter*, 221 sq. Bérard, I. 69, thinks it Egyptian; cp. Assmann in *Philolog.* LXVII. 173. The *-nth-* ending is significant to some.

But one thing seems certain, that the inference that Scheria is non-

[1] Miss Harrison, *Prolegg.* 611, accepts the quaint suggestion of Eustathius that he is so described in δ 564 *πρὸς ἡδονὴν Μενελάῳ*!

[2] In Minos' case a similar doubt has been restated by Professor Ridgeway.

terrestrial is unwarranted. Elysium is on the earth, and mortals sent there retain their mortality. They are by a special dispensation exempted from the common lot—Gladstone, *Synchronism*, 228, and cp. Rohde in *Rhein. Mus.* L, 29 n., who characterizes E. Meyer's view that those housed in Elysium are *Gottheiten* as 'unprovable and not in the least probable.' Cp. also Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *Elysium*, 2470. That is clear also from the passage in δ. Menelaus is not to die, and the beings on the Plain to which he is to be translated are *ἄνθρωποι*, who live a very pleasant life.[1] Only in later times was Elysium made extra-terrestrial—Miss Hutchinson, *Aeacus*, 42. That the Elysian Plain is conceived as near Scheria need not disturb us, even if it be the fact. All that is said of its position in δ 561 sqq. is that it is at the *πείρατα γαίης*. Cp. *ἐπὶ πείρασι γαίης*, *Hym. Ven.* 217, of Tithonos, a mortal still and enjoying the society of a goddess, but somewhere on earth, not in Olympus, and Hesiod, *Opp.* 167 sqq. These indications agree with the tradition that by Scheria was meant Corcyra. There had been voyagings to the West before the first millennium B.C. opens with the foundation of colonies there—cp. Sir W. Ramsay in *C.J.* XIII. 70. Corcyra was just beyond the Achaean world, and beyond it again was the unknown or the little known West, in which the folk located Elysium and other wonderful places. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico* or *pro horrifico*, and the peoples who were rumoured to live beyond an unexplored mountain tract, or across a *μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης*, came to be regarded as no ordinary mortals. Popular imagination was fed by sailors' stories which were inspired by two motives, the glorification of their own exploits and the desire to deter others from following in their tracks. Polybius, IV. 42, 7, quoted by Preller, *Aufsätze*, 463, describes these as *ἡ τῶν πλοϊζομένων ψευδολογία καὶ τερατεία*, and imagination went to one extreme or the other. In the dimly known West there was, as Hepp puts it, *Politisches u. Sociales aus d. Il. u. Od.* 63, 'alles Geheimnissvolle was das Menschenherz anziehen und abschrecken kann.' The unknown peoples were either savage ogres, like the Cyclopes or the Laestrygones, or gentle favourites of the gods, as the Hyperboreans[2]—Pauly-Wissowa, *l.c.* 2475, or dwellers in *Insulae Fortunatae*, like the inhabitants of the Delectable Land fabled by the people of Western Europe to lie far away in the West—Stjerna, *op. cit.* 104. Cp. the 'island-valley of Avilion,' where Arthur was to heal him of his grievous wound. The Adriatic, in which the Minoans appear to have traded, was later a *mare clausum* to the Achaeans, and, considering what they knew of the general amenity of Corcyra, it may well be that they located Elysium in some island further up the Adriatic coast. Since writing this section I have had access to Malten's excellent paper *Elysion u. Rhadamanthys* in the *Archäol. Jahrb.* 1913, 35 sqq., but as he expressly refrains from inferences from the passage in η, it has not helped me. Good grounds are adduced for believing that Rhadamanthys was in origin a Cretan divinity, but some considerations which tell

[1] So Burnet, *The Socratic Doctrine of the Soul*, 14. 'These really do not die at all.'

[2] On whom see Miss Macurdy's interesting paper in *C.R.* XXX. 180 sqq. For the meaning of the name we have either 'above the Bora, or Balkans,' or 'behind the north wind.'

against that view seem to be overlooked. To the Greeks he had become merely a *Mann der Vorzeit.*

And, finally, the Phaeacians are sometimes said to be non-human because they are classed with the Cyclopes and Gigantes, as when Alkinoos says they are nearly related to the gods, ὥσπερ Κύκλωπές τε καὶ ἄγρια φῦλα Γιγάντων. But these latter are only the wild tribes of the West, inhabiting coasts as little known as once were the 'Bermoothes,' which were supposed to be 'inchanted and inhabited with witches and deuills.' They are on a par with the Kentauroi or Pheres ('hairy beasts') of Thessaly, on whom see Wace and Thompson, *Prehc. Thessaly*, 252, and Fick, *Hattid.* 29. The Kyklopes and Gigantes are not divine or semi-divine beings as they were to later Greek mythology from Hesiod's time, but merely peoples still living in conditions of prehistoric savagery. As Uschold, *Gesch. d. Troj. Krieges*, 248, puts it, they were 'rohe Nomaden,' and only later through exaggeration in story made into 'Ungeheuren.' That was understood in antiquity, e.g. by Pausanias, VIII. 29. 2 —θνητοὺς ὄντας καὶ οὐ θεῖον γένος. They were not regarded by Homer as ordinary ἄνδρες or ἄνθρωποι; that is clear from κ 120 of the Gigantes and φ 303 of the Kentauroi. But they were human beings all the same, ζ 5 and η 57, though almost superhuman in their brutal savagery. They may be called divine by descent, but so were the Phaeacians, and many Achaean and all other ἄνδρες. Farnell, *Cults*, IV. 23 n., observes, *à propos* of Beloch's view of the Minyans, that very real peoples have fabulous and divine ancestors. The wild ways of such folk beyond the pale were exaggerated as a matter of course.[1] That is how Giants have come into existence in other parts of the world. See 'Giant' in the *Encycl. Brit.* For Palestine see Macalister, *The Philistines*, 60, for Albion and Erin, Mackenzie, *op. cit.* 331, and for the Anglo-Saxon conception, Stjerna, *op. cit.* 38.

This completes the tale of the grounds, and I think we may say θύραζε Κῆρες! and fairly hope that their Anthesteria is done. There is no basis for a theory. The *märchenhaft* idea ran the usual Homeric course. It got a start, became the mode, and rose to the position of an accepted tenet, admitting of 'no dispute.' It was so tempting, as Mülder has remarked, *Phäakendichtung*, 12, to withdraw the improbable and the not readily intelligible from criticism by means of the *märchenhaft* label. The matter in the narrative was anything but what it seemed to be. Prepossession thus prevented an ordinary, everyday, human interpretation, or a proper investigation of the significance of the incidents of the Phaeacian episode. There must be supernaturalness, and 'each one as before did chase His favourite phantom.' It is by similar procedure, as Kroll points out, *l.c.* 180, that 'echte Sage' are often determined. An enquirer accepts a popular theory, and 'saga' is genuine if it fits it. In our case a community of mortals has been elevated to supernatural dignity because a poet mixes some unappreciated chaff in his description of their ways.

A. SHEWAN.

ST. ANDREWS.

[1] Cp. Norlin in *C.P.* XII. 352.

NOTES ON MARTIAL.

I 68.

QVIDQVID agit Rufus, nihil est nisi Naeuia Rufo.
si gaudet, si flet, si tacet, hanc loquitur.
cenat, propinat, poscit, negat, innuit: una est
Naeuia; si non sit Naeuia, mutus erit.
scriberet hesterna patri cum luce salutem,
'Naeuia lux,' inquit, 'Naeuia lumen, haue.'
haec legit et ridet demisso Naeuia uoltu.
Naeuia non una est: quid, uir inepte, furis?

The old interpretations of the last line are fairly represented by Nisard's version, 'Névia n'est pas à toi seul; pourquoi donc, sot amant, une passion si folle?' They suppose that *una* can mean 'uno contenta', and so put themselves out of court. Friedlaender explains thus: 'Der Sinn scheint zu sein: Naeuia liest das Epigramm und lacht, aber Rufus ist thöricht sich zu ereifern, wenn er dies hört. [He is indeed, incredibly so.] Es giebt ja mehr als eine Naeuia, ich kann also auch eine andere meinen. [No, Martial cannot mean any other Naeuia than the one whom Rufus loves.] Zugleich giebt M. wol zu verstehen: Jedes andere Mädchen kann ihm die Stelle des ihn verschmähenden ersetzen.' Zugleich! Mr G. Friedrich may well say in *Rhein. Mus.* 1907 p. 367 'Friedländer hat das Epigramm nicht verstanden'; but he himself proceeds to weave out of nothing a fabric which is not worth the trouble of tearing to pieces: suffice it to say that he forgets to give any interpretation whatsoever of the words *Naeuia non una est.*

All commentators assume that the vocative *uir inepte* is addressed to Rufus. Most of them simply treat *uir* as if it were *homo*; a smaller number see that it ought to mean *marite*, but of these some say that for present purposes it means *adulter*, while others commit the crowning absurdity of supposing that Rufus and Naeuia were man and wife. *uir* means, quite straightforwardly, 'husband'; any husband whose wife's name happens to be Naeuia. The contents of the epigram are the following. Rufus is distraught with love of Naeuia; so distraught that yesterday he began a letter to his father with 'Naeuia darling.' Naeuia peruses this anecdote, so flattering to the vanity of her sex, with a demure smirk of self-complacency. At this point readers who are married to ladies of the name of Naeuia begin to fume and chafe, because it is intolerable that their wives should be represented as taking

pleasure in a lover's passion. 'Be calm' says Martial; 'there is more than one Naeuia in the world: why assume that the beloved of Rufus is your wife?'

I subjoin two illustrative parallels. From book III: 8 'Thaida Quintus amat. quam Thaida? Thaida luscam. | unum oculum Thais non habet, ille duos', 11 'si tua nec Thais nec lusca est, Quinte, puella, | cur in te factum distichon esse putas? . . . tu tamen es Quintus. mutemus nomen amantis: | si non uult Quintus, Thaida Sextus amet'. From book IX: 95 'Alphius ante fuit, coepit nunc Olphius esse, | uxorem postquam duxit, Athenagoras', 95B 'nomen Athenagorae credis, Callistrate, uerum. | si scio, dispeream, qui sit Athenagoras. | sed puta me uerum, Callistrate, dicere nomen: | non ego sed uester peccat Athenagoras'.

III 20 1-5.

dic, Musa, quid agat Canius meus Rufus.
utrumne chartis tradit ille uicturis
legenda temporum acta Claudianorum,
an quae Neroni falsus adstruit scriptor
an aemulatur improbi iocos Phaedri? 5

The difficulty of explaining this last verse has been somewhat exaggerated. It is true that both *improbus* and *iocus* have associations (see for instance III 86 4 'non sunt haec mimis *improbiora*' and I 35 13 sq. 'parcas lusibus et *iocis* rogamus | nec castrare uelis meos libellos') which, when the two words are thus brought together, suggest the notion of lascivious poetry; and true that among the extant fables of Phaedrus there is not one lascivious piece, and many moral. But Phaedrus himself describes his fables as *ioci*, I *prol.* 7 'fictis *iocari* nos meminerit fabulis', IV 7 1 sq. 'tu qui, nasute, scripta destringis mea | et hoc *iocorum* legere fastidis genus'; and *improbus*, which is capable of meaning 'disrespectful', as in Hor. *epist.* I 7 63 and elsewhere, may allude to those hits at the high and mighty which are supposed to have provoked the displeasure of Seianus.

iocos however is not the MS text, but *locos* γ, *locus* β; and these lections are just as near to *logos*, which is less misleading and leaves *improbi* freer to mean what it ought. *logi* are fables: Ar. *pac.* 129 ἐν τοῖσιν Αἰσώπου λόγοις, Quint. *inst.* V 11 20 '*aînon* Graeci uocant et Αἰσωπείους, ut dixi, λόγους et Λιβυκούς', Sen. *dial.* XI 8 3 'fabellas quoque et Aesopeos *logos* (*longos* MSS)'. The MSS of Plautus give *locos* for *logos* at *Men.* 779 and *Stich.* 221 (some of them at 383 and 393), and perhaps the same error occurs in Phaedrus himself, III *prol.* 34-7:

seruitus obnoxia,
quia quae uolebat non audebat dicere,
affectus proprios in fabellas transtulit
calumniamque fictis elusit *locis*.

Editors print *iocis*, which gets support from the *iocari* of the similar verse I *prol.* 7 quoted above; but its *fictis . . . fabulis* gives equal support to '*fictis* elusit *logis*'.

The *locus* of β perhaps points to *logus*, for it is possible that Martial gave the Greek word its Greek inflexion, as he did, if we may trust his MSS, in the genitive *Praxitelus* IV 39 3. Neue's examples of the acc. plur. *-us* for *-ovs* in vol. I p. 209 ed. 3 may be augmented from Lucian Mueller *Lucil.* p. 256; and the palimpsest of Fronto p. 148 Nab. has 'ceratinas et soritas et *pseudomenus*'.

V 16 5-8.

nam, si falciferi defendere templa Tonantis
sollicitisque uelim uendere uerba reis,
plurimus Hispanas mittet mihi nauta metretas
et fiet uario sordidus aere sinus.

falciferi templa Tonantis must mean, as Gronouius says, the aerarium in the temple of Saturn. And why should it not? why does Haupt say in *opusc.* III p. 500 'adparet ineptissimum esse *tonantis*', and why do Friedlaender and Duff affix the obelus? Saturn, it is very true, was not the Thunderer, but neither was Propertius Callimachus nor Domitian Nero; yet Juvenal calls Domitian *caluus Nero* and Propertius calls himself *Romanus Callimachus.* The Latin poets, with Hom. *Il.* IX 457 Ζεὺς . . . καταχθόνιος to lend them countenance, will often take the name of Jove in vain and attach to it an epithet explaining what person they really mean: Verg. *Aen.* IV 638 (Ouid. *fast.* V 448, Sil. I 386) *Ioui Stygio* (Diti[1]), Sen. *H. f.* 47 *inferni Iouis*, 608 *diro . . . Ioui*, *H.O.* 1705 (Sil. VIII 116, Stat. *Theb.* II 49) *nigri . . . Iouis*, Val. Fl. I 730 (Sil. II 674) *Tartareo . . . Ioui*, III 384 sq. *tremendi . . . Iouis*, Stat. *Theb.* I 615 sq. *profundo . . . Ioui*, Auson. 250 8 *Iouis Elysii*; Stat. *Ach.* I 48 sq. *secundi Iouis* (Neptuni), Claud. XVII 282 *Iouis aequorei*, Apoll. Sid. *carm.* 22 158 *tridentiferi Iouis*; Stat. *silu.* III 4 18 *Iuppiter Ausonius* (Domitianus), Mart. XIV 1 2 *nostrum . . . Iouem. Tonans*, being a synonym, suffers the same usage: Stat. *Theb.* XI 209 *inferno . . . Tonanti* (Diti), Mart. IX 39 1 *Palatino . . . Tonanti* (Domitiano). In Sen. *Med.* 59 *sceptriferis . . . Tonantibus* (Ioui et Iunoni) the word signifies only 'sovereign of heaven'; and by *falciferi Tonantis* Martial means no more than what he says in XII 62 1 'antiqui rex magne poli mundique prioris'.

This calls to my mind a misinterpreted passage of Statius, *silu.* I 6 39-42.

i nunc saecula compara, Vetustas,
antiqui Iouis aureumque tempus:
non sic libera uina tunc fluebant
nec tardum seges occupabat annum.

'*antiqui Iouis* das erste, silberne Zeitalter Iuppiters (Ou. *met.* I 113 ff.)' says

[1] So Proserpine is called *Iuno Stygia, Auerna, Aetnaea, inferna, infera, profunda.*

Mr Vollmer. It was not in the silver age that wine flowed all abroad: Jove's accession put a stop to that, 'et passim riuis currentia uina repressit' *antiquus Iuppiter*, like *falcifer Tonans*, is Saturn, 'aureus . . . Saturnus' Verg. *georg.* II 538. So already F. Morellus.

V 66.

saepe salutatus numquam prior ipse salutas.
sic eris aeternum, Pontiliane, uale.

In the days before Schneidewin editors used to read *erit* with inferior MSS; the present text is expounded thus: 'The poet says that . . . he will have no more to do with him: he shall be to the poet *aeternum uale*, a good-bye for ever' (Paley and Stone, 1868). Such words have no meaning. By saying good-bye to a person you do not transform him into a good-bye. Munro punctuated 'sic eris aeternum, Pontiliane? uale'; but nobody would use *aeternum* here instead of *semper*, and Verg. *Aen.* XI 97 sq. 'salue aeternum mihi . . . aeternumque uale' discountenances or even forbids this divorce of the verb and adverb. I should write therefore

sic eris? aeternum, Pontiliane, uale.

'Is that how you mean to behave? then farewell for ever (you are to me as dead).' IX 7 4 'non uis, Afer, hauere: uale'. *sic*, as in Munro's punctuation, stands for *talis*: Ter. *Phorm.* 527 'sic sum; si placeo, utere', Cic. *pro Q. Rosc.* 29 'sic est uulgus', Tib. I 10 43 'sic ego sim', Hom. *Il.* XI 762 ὣς ἔον.

VI 14.

uersus scribere posse te disertos
adfirmas, Laberi: quid ergo non uis?
uersus scribere qui potest disertos,
non scribat, Laberi: uirum putabo.

For *non scribat* Schneidewin in his second edition wrote *conscribat*; Friedlaender Gilbert and Lindsay follow him, and Duff marks *non scribat* as corrupt. *conscribat* I suppose will mean something like 'make a book of them'; but nothing of this sort will accord with *uirum putabo*. The force of *uirum* may be seen from II 69 'inuitum cenare foris te, Classice, dicis: . . . en rogat ad cenam Melior te, Classice, rectam. | grandia uerba ubi sunt? si *uir* es, ecce nega.' If a person can write accomplished verse, he gives no proof of stoutness or manfulness by indulging his faculty: to refrain from indulging it, *non scribere*, may at any rate be held to argue strength of will and contempt of fame. But I imagine that Schneidewin's difficulty was this: *non scribat* evidently must suggest the pursuit of a course which Laberius did not pursue, and yet 'quid ergo non uis?' implies that 'non scribere uersus disertos' was the course which he did pursue. Yes, but there are two ways of not writing accomplished verse. One is to write nothing, *non scribere*; and

if the epigram ended with line 2 we should perhaps infer that this was what Laberius did. Line 4 lets us know that it was not: scribebat ille quidem uersus, sed non disertos.

The phrase *uirum putabo* recurs in a passage of Cicero, *ad Q. frat.* II 9 (=10 =11) 3, which does not reflect much credit on its critics, whether radical or conservative.

Lucreti poemata, ut scribis, ita sunt, multis luminibus ingenii, multae tamen artis. sed, cum ueneris. uirum te putabo, si Sallusti Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo.

After suffering various changes in the past from Ernesti, Orelli, Lachmann, Bergk, Munro, and others, it is now printed as above by Messrs Tyrrell and Purser and the last editor Mr Sjoegren; and they are quite satisfied with it and with themselves. 'Lucretius' books of poetry, as you say in your letter, have many scintillations of genius, yet much art as well': *tamen* is explained, after Munro in the introduction to his commentary on Lucretius, as implying that there is almost an incongruity between genius (like that of Ennius) and art (like that of Catullus and Caluus), and that Lucretius combined two virtues which might be thought irreconcilable. 'But more on that matter when you are here'[1]: *cum ueneris* has this sense in *ad Att.* II 3 1 'quid sit sciemus, cum ueneris' and elsewhere, and the principal verb is similarly omitted ibid. XII 21 2 'sed coram', 'but more of this when we meet'.

Very well: and now what of the last sentence? 'I shall think you a stout-hearted man if you get through Sallust's Empedoclea, I shall not think you a human being.' That the same person under the same conditions should be *uir* and should not be *homo* is a contradiction in terms. If one is not a human being, one cannot be a stout-hearted man nor a man of any sort; one is either above or below humanity, a god or a beast; and *uir* is not Latin for a stout-hearted god nor for a stout-hearted beast. Applied to any creature not human, it means either a male or a husband; and here it can mean neither. Yet Vahlen *opusc.* I p. 154, far from perceiving the discrepancy, maintains in opposition to Bergk that *uirum te putabo* and *hominem non putabo* are inseparably associated; and to defend this sentence, where the same person is *uir* and yet not *homo*, he quotes, if you will believe me, sentences where the same person is both *homo* and *uir*: Cic. *ad fam.* V 17 3 'ut et *hominem* te et *uirum* esse meminisses, id est, communem incertumque casum . . . sapienter ferres et dolori fortiter ac fortunae resisteres', 'in other words, that you should bear philosophically the changes and chances which are our common portion (as *homo*), and show a bold face to pain and misfortune (as *uir*)'; *Tusc.* II 53 'Marius et tulit dolorem, ut *uir*, et, ut *homo*, maiorem ferre sine causa necessaria

[1] 'Diese Ansicht hat zuerst F. Marx (*Berl. phil. Woch.* 1891 Sp. 834) vorgebracht' says Schanz *Gesch. d. röm. Litt.* I ii p. 43 ed. 3. It was put forward by Tyrrell in 1886. There is another false attribution in the next epistle, II 10 1, where the emendation *pipulo* for *populi*, ascribed by Mr Sjoegren in his edition to Housmanius and in his *commentationes Tullianae* p. 158 to Housmannus, is due to neither of those critics, but again to Tyrrell.

noluit'; Sen. *dial.* XI 17 2 'nam et non sentire mala sua non est *hominis*, et non ferre non est *uiri*',—you are both *homo* and *uir*, and you therefore both feel and endure. The effect of these passages is to enhance by contrast the strangeness of what we find in the letter to Quintus. And when Vahlen has concluded his very untoward citations and comes to the definite explanation of the words before us, he is obliged to invent for *homo* a sense which belongs to it neither in the citations nor anywhere else: he says it means a man of taste, possessing 'pulchri sensum et decori'. Another and very different defence of the text is essayed by Tyrrell and Purser, who rely chiefly upon elegant mistranslation. *hominem esse* they interpret 'to be subject to the ordinary weaknesses of humanity': correct 'ordinary' to 'universal' and the attempt collapses.

So long as these words are left in their present condition, to say with Mr Sjoegren that the passage is 'locus iniuria temptatus' is to holloa before you are out of the wood. The correction of this sentence may, for aught we know, involve some change in the preceding sentences, like the conjectures of Bergk and Munro. I think it probable however that the true correction is one which does not. A second protasis may have fallen out thus: 'uirum te putabo, <si . . >; si Sallusti Empedoclea legeris, hominem non putabo', 'if you can read through . . ., you are a man indeed; if you can read through Sallust's Empedoclea, you are more or less than human'.

VI 29 7 sq.

inmodicis breuis est aetas et rara senectus.
quidquid ames, cupias non placuisse nimis.

ames is read by Scriuerius and some other of the older editors, but *amas* by Schneidewin and all the moderns except Mr Duff. According to Mr Lindsay's apparatus criticus *ames* is the reading of β and *amas* of γ; but his collations in *Ancient editions of Martial* p. 82 show that E, the best MS of the latter family, gives *ames* in agreement with the former. *ames* therefore has much the better authority to uphold it; and it is also upheld by something much better than any authority, the sense. This poem is addressed to no individual, and there is nobody for the 2nd pers. indic. to refer to. The words must mean 'whatever one loves', and the subjunctive is then the proper mood, as in Ouid. *art.* I 741 'non tutum est, *quod ames*, laudare sodali', *her.* XX 31 sq. 'sit fraus huic facto nomen dicarque dolosus, | si tamen est, *quod ames*, uelle tenere dolus', Lucr. IV 1061 sq. 'nam, si abest *quod ames*, praesto simulacra tamen sunt | illius', Cic. *de sen.* 27 'quod est, eo decet uti et, *quidquid agas*, agere pro uiribus'.

In this passage of Cicero Dr Reid prints *agis* for *agas* and has the following note:

quidquid agis: all MSS and editions hitherto have *agas*, which I have unhesitatingly altered because (1) the subjunctive does not occur in Cicero after *quisquis*,

quicumque, ubi and the like unless in *oratio obliqua* or by the attraction of the indicative into the mood of a neighbouring subjunctive, (2) *agas* would be doubly peculiar after *quod est*. See a valuable note by Kühner on *Tusc.* I 110, whose conclusions are entirely confirmed by my own reading. Thus in *de or.* III 201 the clause *quibuscumque uerbis uti uelis* is parallel with and influenced by the preceding conditional clause *si uerba mutaris*.

Cicero employs the subjunctive where the sense requires that mood, *quisquis* or no *quisquis*; and the sense requires it here. Cato's meaning is not 'quidquid tu, Scipio, agis' but 'quidquid agimus', 'whatever one does'. This construction, whose occurrence in Cicero Dr Reid denies, recurs at *de off.* III 57 'neque enim id est celare, *quidquid reticeas*, sed cum, quod tu scias, id ignorare emolumenti tui causa uelis eos quorum intersit id scire', and also, though the eye alone cannot there detect it, at *de amic.* 22 'amicitia res plurimas continet; *quoquo* te *uerteris*, praesto est'. Even in the passage cited by Dr Reid, *de or.* III 200 'inter conformationem uerborum et sententiarum hoc interest, quod uerborum tollitur, si uerba mutaris, sententiarum permanet, *quibuscumque* uerbis uti *uelis*', the mood is due to no external influence but to inherent propriety, and *uelis* would remain *uelis* if there were nothing but indicatives in the neighbourhood. As for *agas* after *quod est*, far from being doubly peculiar, it is both logical and regular, like Lucr. II 850 'quoad *licet* ac *possis* reperire' or Ouid. *amor.* III 14 7 sq. 'quis furor est, quae nocte *latent*, in luce fateri | et, quae clam *facias*, facta referre palam?'

VIII 56 17-20.

excidit attonito pinguis Galatea poetae
Thestylis et rubras messibus usta genas:
protinus Italiam concepit et ARMA VIRVMQVE
qui modo uix culicem fleuerat ore rudi.

Schneidewin and all his successors print ITALIAM or indicate by other means that they regard this word, like ARMA VIRVMQVE, as a quotation. But whence is it quoted? not surely from *Aen.* I 2. *Italiam* in that line is not an object of *cano* but merely one of a dozen words in a relative clause; it signifies no conception or design of Virgil's; and in any case it would be perverse to cite the opening of the second line before the famous and symbolic opening of the whole epic.

Schrevel and other of the earlier editors give the verse as I do. *Italiam* means the theme of Italy. Whether this also refers to the *Aeneid*, especially book VII and verses 641-4 'pandite nunc Helicona, deae, cantusque mouete, | qui bello exciti reges, quae quemque secutae | complerint campos acies, quibus Itala iam tum | floruerit terra alma uiris, quibus arserit armis', or whether to the *georgics* and especially to the laudes Italiae in II 136-76, it is possible to doubt.

IX 20 5 sq.

hic steterat ueneranda domus quae praestitit orbi
quod Rhodos astrifero quod pia Creta polo.

The birthplace of Domitian is equalled to Crete, the birthplace of Jove, and to Rhodes, the birthplace of whom? Of Neptune, say the commentators; for Posidon, though not indeed born in Rhodes, was reared there by the Telchines, Diod. Sic. V 55 1. Neptune however has no particular connexion with *astrifer polus*, and the god meant is Sol, who according to one story was born in his own chosen island. Cic. *n. d.* III 54 'Soles ipsi quam multi a theologis proferuntur! unus eorum Ioue natus, nepos Aetheris, alter Hyperione, tertius Vulcano, Nili filio, cuius urbem Aegyptii uolunt esse eam quae Heliopolis appellatur, quartus is quem heroicis temporibus Acantho Rhodi peperisse dicitur', Ampel. 9 3, Arnob. *nat.* IV 14, schol. Bern. ad Luc. VIII 248.

Tiberius is likened to the Sun by Manilius IV 765 sq. and by Antiphilus *anth. Pal.* IX 178; and the shepherd in buc. Einsidl. I 27 is uncertain, as Martial seems to be, whether his emperor more resembles the supreme deity or the chief light in the firmament: 'seu caeli mens illa fuit seu Solis imago'.

IX 99.

Marcus amat nostras Antonius, Attice, musas,
charta salutatrix si modo uera refert,
Marcus, Palladiae non infitianda Tolosae
gloria, quem genuit pacis alumna quies.
tu, qui longa potes dispendia ferre uiarum,
i, liber, absentis pignus amicitiae.
uilis eras, fateor, si te nunc mitteret emptor;
grande tui pretium muneris auctor erit.
multum, crede mihi, refert a fonte bibatur
quae fluit an pigro quae stupet unda lacu.

4. The singularly unintelligent conjecture *quam* for *quem*, proposed long ago by Scriuerius, has been repeated by Friedlaender and adopted by Gilbert. 'Das überlieferte *quem* ist unhaltbar' says Friedlaender, 'denn der Friede konnte nur den Ruhm des Antonius . . . erzeugen, aber nicht ihn selbst'. *gloria* does not mean 'der Ruhm des Antonius', and would make nonsense if it did: it means Antonius himself, who was the glory of Toulouse. The conjecture therefore does not alter the sense, it only corrupts the Latin. *quam* is not grammatical: no more grammatical than *quae* would be in IV 55 1-3 'Luci, *gloria* temporum tuorum, | *qui* Caium ueterem Tagumque nostrum | Arpis cedere non sinis disertis'; no more grammatical than the *deuoraturam* which Geppert fancied he had found in the palimpsest at Plaut. *rud.* 543 sq. 'iam postulabas te, impurata *belua*, | totam Siciliam *deuoraturum* insulam'. 'Wer von Grammatik und Sprachgebrauch nur eine mäszige Kenntniss hat,

sieht auf den ersten Blick, dass . . . *deuoraturam*, wenn es auch im Palimpsest stünde, nichts als ein zufälliger Schreibfehler sein würde' said Ritschl *opusc.* II p. 226; and so say I of *quam*. That Antonius should be called the child of tranquillity is quite in keeping with X 23 'iam numerat *placido felix* Antonius *aeuo* | quindecies actas Primus olympiadas, | praeteritosque dies et *tutos* (*βγ*, *totos a*) respicit *annos* . . . nulla recordanti lux est ingrata grauisque; | nulla fuit, cuius non meminisse uelit'. It is clear from the whole tenour of the three or four poems in which Martial celebrates him that this Antonius Primus of Tolosa is wrongly identified by Friedlaender and Klebs *prosop. imp. Rom.* I p. 103 and Pauly-Wissowa *Real-encycl.* I pp. 2635-7 with his namesake and townsman the soldier and politician, whose turbulent character and eventful career we know from the *histories* of Tacitus, and whose praenomen we do not know to have been Marcus.

8. The gross blunder committed by the Delphin editor, and apparently not by him alone, of mistaking *tui* for an adjective in agreement with *muneris*, is avoided by Nisard and Stephenson, who translate 'ce qui te donne du prix, c'est que tu es un présent de l'auteur', 'as a present from the author, your value will be indefinitely enhanced'. These versions give the substance of the thought, but I cannot help wondering if the translators have avoided another error, committed by the *thes. ling. Lat.* II p. 1211 14. There this verse is cited among passages in which *auctor* is 'auctor carminis, eum significans qui fecit'. Martial was indeed the author of the book which he sent to Antonius, but no allusion to that fact is contained in the word *auctor*. If the 'emptor' imagined in the verse above had been the sender, he would have been *muneris auctor* instead of Martial, though Martial would still have been author of the book. *muneris auctor* is a regular phrase, illustrated in the *thesaurus* p. 1202 64-9, and meaning simply 'is qui dat': see for instance Mart. VIII 51 22 '*auctor* enim tanti *muneris* (phialae) ille mihi', and add V 52 7 sq. 'quamuis ingentia, Postume, dona | *auctoris* pereunt garrulitate sui', IX 49 6 '(toga) *auctoris* nomine digna sui'. The verse means only 'the giver will make you precious', and the closest parallel is Ouid. *her.* XVII 71 sq. 'acceptissima semper | *munera* sunt, *auctor* quae *pretiosa* facit', where Heinsius says 'unice haec illustrat epigr. 99 lib. IX apud Martialem'.

X 24.

natales mihi Martiae kalendae,
lux formosior omnibus kalendis,
qua mittunt mihi munus et puellae,
quinquagensima liba septimamque
uestris addimus hanc focis acerram.
his uos, si tamen expedit roganti,
annos addite bis, precor, nouenos,
ut nondum nimia piger senecta

sed uitae tribus areis peractis
lucos Elysiae petam puellae. 10
post hoc Nestora nec diem rogabo.

It is Martial's 57th birthday, and his prayer is for 18 years more of life, that so he may die at 75, not in extreme old age but 'uitae tribus areis peractis'. *tribus areis* is explained as meaning *tribus spatiis*, though *area* has not that sense elsewhere; and the three courses run are said to be *pueritia*, *iuuentus*, *senectus*. But Martial's own words, 'nondum nimia piger senecta', show that *senectus* is not to be *peracta*. *area* therefore must somehow mean a period of 25 years; and neither Scriuerius here nor Scaliger at Manil. III 560 succeeds in showing how it can.

But though *areis* stands in the text of all modern editions it is only a conjectural alteration of *aureis*. This word in itself is more capable of the required meaning, since the aureus was reckoned equivalent to 25 denarii. But it is not apparent why the denarius rather than the sestertius or the as should be taken to symbolise a year, and *peractis* is not suitable to this noun.

Now 75 is $\frac{3}{4}$ of 100, and a century was in popular opinion the utmost span of human life: Varr. *l. L.* VI 11 'saeclum spatium annorum centum uocarunt, dictum a sene, quod longissimum spatium senescendorum hominum id putarunt', Seru. *Aen.* VI 325 'centum autem annos ideo dicit quia hi sunt legitimi uitae humanae'. The sense therefore will be satisfied if the place of *aureis* is taken by a word which can mean a quarter. And although Mr Lindsay's apparatus criticus says only '*areis* Ald.: *aureis* codd.', his collations (*Anc. ed. of Mart.* p. 101) disclose the very important fact that L has *auribus*. L is the best MS of the better family, and the only MS of that family which has not been invaded by lections derived from the other; and its authority is therefore about equal to that of all the remaining MSS put together. This variant leads me to the conjecture 'uitae tribus *arcubus* peractis'. The Latin *arcus* means the same as the English *arc*, a portion of the circumference of a circle, in Germ. *phaen.* 572 'orbis perfecti diuisus tollitur *arcus*', in Manil. III 212 sq. 'cursibus aeternis mundum per signa uolantem | ut totum lustret curuatis *arcubus* orbem', and in II 853, to be cited anon. In Germanicus the portion signified is half, in Manil. III 213 the size of the arc cannot be determined from the context, but in II 853 it is a quarter. Astrologers divide the circle of the zodiac, by means of the four *κέντρα* or *cardines* at which the horizon and meridian intersect it, into four arcs or *τεταρτημόρια*, and to these they assign the governance of four stages of human life. Manilius describes them thus, II 844-55, 'quidquid ab exortu summum curuatur in orbem | aetatis primae nascentisque adserit annos. | quod summo premitur deuexum culmine mundi | donec ad occasus ueniat, puerilibus annis | succedit teneramque regit sub sede iuuentam. | quae pars occasus aufert imumque sub orbem | descendit, regit haec maturae tempora uitae | perpetua serie uarioque exercita cursu. | at, qua perficitur cursus redeunte sibimet, | tarda supinatum lassatis uiribus

arcum | ascendens, seros demum complectitur annos | labentemque diem uitae tremulamque senectam'. In Paul. Alex. fol. D 3 ed. 1586 the first arc corresponds to *τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν, λέγω δὲ τὴν νεότητα*, the second to *τὴν μετὰ τὴν νεότητα ἡλικίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶ μέση*, the third to *τὴν τοῦ γήρως ἡλικίαν*, and the fourth to *τὴν πρεσβυτικὴν ἡλικίαν ἕως τῆς τοῦ θανάτου τελευτῆς*; and this appears to be the distribution which Martial has in view. There are other passages of Latin poetry which possibly or probably refer to this astrological scheme of *κέντρα* and *τεταρτημόρια*: Luc. VII 380 sq. 'ultima fata | deprecor ac turpes extremi *cardinis* annos', Sen. *Tro.* 52 'mortalis aeui *cardinem* extremum premens'.

XII 59.

tantum dat tibi Roma basiorum
post annos modo quindecim reuerso
quantum Lesbia non dedit Catullo.
te uicinia tota, te pilosus
hircoso premit osculo colonus,
hinc instat tibi textor, inde fullo,
hinc sutor modo pelle basiata,
hinc menti dominus periculosi,
hinc { dexiocholus et β / dexiocolus γ } inde lippus
fellatorque recensque cunnilingus.
iam tanti tibi non fuit redire.

Although some MSS of the family γ offer *desiocolus* and *desioculus*, whence the impossible word *defioculus* was coined and issued in the old editions, it is plain from a comparison of the two stocks that *dexioc(h)olus* was in the archetype. But *dexiocholus* (if ever there was such a word) is no better sense than metre. Neither leg, so far as I have noticed, is much used in kissing; and it therefore does not appear how lameness can lend horror to a kiss, nor what difference it makes if the lame leg happens to be the right one. The conjectural substitutes for the letters between *hinc* and *inde* are either violent or absurd: *defioculusque et, caecis oculis et* (with *lippis*), *luscusque oculis et, factus modo luscus, de fornice luscus, et dexiocholus, rex unoculus uel.*[1] If anyone proposed *hinc cui dest oculus, set inde lippus*, I should think it less open to objection, but no truer than the rest; for they all leave the poem labouring under a defect which they do not even aim at repairing.

[1] This last conjecture is Mr Birt's, and very like him. In the same place, *Rhein. Mus.* 1916 pp. 274-6, he corrupts the *menti* of u. 8 into *uenti*, of all things in the world, because *menti periculosi* 'ist offenbar Unsinn'. I therefore cite Plin. *n. h.* XXVI 2 'grauissimum ex his (nouis faciei morbis) lichenas appellauere Graeco nomine, Latine, quoniam a *mento* fere oriebatur, . . . *mentagram*,' 3 'non fuerat haec lues apud maiores patresque nostros, et primum Ti. Claudi Caesaris principatu medio inrepsit in Italiam quodam Perusino equite Romano quaestorio scriba, cum in Asia adparuisset, inde *contagionem* eius importante. nec sensere id malum feminae aut seruitia plebesque humilis aut media, sed proceres *ueloci transitu osculi* maxime'.

There are in Martial many epigrams addressed to persons whom he does not call by name. Some of these, II 85 and IV 19 and many in books XIII and XIV, are *xenia* or *apophoreta*: the person is merely the recipient of a gift, and his name and address were on the parcel. In one poem, V 60, the name is designedly withheld. There remains a large class, comprising I 66, II 39, 61, 76, III 23, 49, IV 41, 47, 76, 88, VI 64, VII 25, 75, VIII 14, 34, 47, 74, X 45, 59, 100, XI 22, 44, XII 26, 37, 47, 48, 50, 86, in which the persons addressed are chosen as types or invented for the occasion. From that class this epigram is excluded, if by nothing else, by the touch of personal detail in u. 2, 'post annos modo quindecim reuerso': it is addressed at a particular time to a living and breathing acquaintance of Martial's, and in view of Martial's practice we expect to have his name. And we have it: *Dexi*. The gens Dexia survives in several inscriptions collected by W. Schulze *Gesch. lat. Eigennamen* p. 272: *C. I. L.* VI 16824 *L. Dexio Ilo*, VIII 2858-60 *Q. Dexius Licinianus*, IX 6078 73 *C. Dexi Staberiani*, X 411 *C. Dexsius*, 534 *Dexio Decumino*, XI 949 *Dexsia*, 4206 sq. *C. Dexius*: add Cic. *ad fam.* VII 23 4 'est enim profectus in Hispaniam *Dexius*.' The name of the person addressed is most commonly put near the beginning of an epigram, but it may be deferred till the last line, as at III 82 33, or the last but one, as at VIII 61 8, or the last but two, as here and at X 73 8, or may stand in the middle, as at VIII 38 8.

Before proceeding further we must ask whether *et* has been wrongly added in β or wrongly subtracted in γ. The parallel of u. 6 is against the conjunction, and no motive for its omission is apparent, whereas it may have been inserted by some one who was at least metrist enough to know that the line ought to have eleven syllables. It seems therefore that criticism has now to deal only with the letters *o c (h) o l u s*.

De Rooy and Munro and Gilbert have all wished to introduce the word *luscus*, and naturally. Martial couples it with *lippus* in VI 78 1 sq. 'lumine uno | *luscus* Phryx erat alteroque *lippus*', VIII 9 1 sq. 'soluere dodrantem nuper tibi, Quinte, uolebat | *lippus* Hylas, *luscus* uult dare dimidium', 59 1-6 'cuius | *lippa* sub adtrita fronte lacuna patet . . . oculo *luscus* utroque uidet', and its appropriateness to this epigram is well shown by II 33 3 'cur non *basio* te, Philaeni? *lusca* es.' *lus* then is probably the surviving half of *lus-cus*, and it only remains to find a pyrrhic which will complete the verse. The sense does not require, and hardly even admits, any addition, so I should expect here the cognomen of Dexius, for Martial often calls his friends by two of their names: I 107 *Luci . . . Iuli*, IV 71 *Safroni Rufe*, VI 85 *Rufe Camoni*, VII 41 *Semproni Tucca*, 47 *Licini . . . Sura*, 68 *Instanti Rufe*, X 33 *Munati Galle*, 44 *Quinte . . . Ouidi*, XI 52 *Iuli Cerialis*, XII 4 *Prisce Terenti*. The nearest to the letters will be the rare cognomen *Colo*: *C. I. L.* VI 32764 *L. Cassio Coloni*, VIII 15472 *Q. Numisius C. f. Arn. Colo Heluacianus*, X 3395 *Camurius Colo*, *Antonius Colo*.

hinc, Dexi Colo, luscus, inde lippus.

A slip from *ol* to *ol* and from *us* to *us* reduces *dexicololuscus* to *dexicolus*, which is, as it happens, the original reading of E. The additional *o* in *dexiocolus* may be that *o* which is often written over a vocative to indicate the case, and which to most readers would be a welcome signpost when the vocative was so unfamiliar as *dexi colo*.

Although this conjecture accounts for every letter in the corrupt text of the MSS, it is not for that reason true, and the truth may be something which is further away from the letters and will not account for them. *Dexi* is the MS reading and *luscus* a probable change, but *Colo*, having nothing better than palaeography to rest on, is quite uncertain, and indeed there is no actual proof that its first syllable is short.

XII 95 1-4.

Musseti pathicissimos libellos,
qui certant Sybariticis libellis,
et tinctas sale pruriente chartas,
Instanti, lege, Rufe.

Musseti codd., *Musaei* edd. And who is this Musaeus? 'Ein sonst unbekannter Autor' says Friedlaender. But, if you know nothing else about him, how do you know his name? who told you it was Musaeus and not, as the MSS say, Mussetius? The latter exists in *C. I. L.* XIV 2982 *Musseti*, and with variations of spelling in XI 5702 and 5718 *L. Musetio*, VIII 6236 *Musetia*, ib. *suppl.* 19168 *Musaetiae*. Martial's Mussetius has as much right to his place in the text, and to a mention in lexicons and histories of literature, as Ovid's Turranius or half-a-dozen other poets out of *ex Pont.* IV 16. But instead of him we find in De Vit's *onomasticon* 'Musaeus, poeta, auctor carminum nefandi argumenti, teste Martial. 12, 95', and in Teuffel's *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.* § 329 4 'Mart. 12, 95 *Musaei pathicissimos libellos* (griechisch ?)'.

The reading of L is *Musetis*, but this is rather *Musseti* with an *s* out of place than a token of the spelling *Museti*.

A. E. Housman.

PHAEDRIANA.

III.

NOVAE FABVLAE (*continued*).

To my restorations of Nouae Fabulae of Phaedrus (*Classical Quarterly* XII. [1918], pp. 151 sqq.), I would now add the following:

VIII. The Sick Kite.

(Thiele No. XXIII.)

For this Fable both Ademar and the Weissenburg MS. (*Wissemburgensis*) fail us. We have, however, the representatives of R, which Thiele groups under his *Recensio Gallicana*, and one (the Codex Vindobonensis lat. 303) which he places in his *Recensio Vetus;* of the other two one does not contain it, and the third, the Erfordtensis at Berlin, has a wholly independent version, which Thiele most strangely regards as imported from 'Phaedrus in prose,' although neither in diction nor in remnants of metre has it anything to suggest such an origin. His 'restoration' (*Einleitung*, p. ccxxi) may accordingly be neglected.

Multos iaceret menses cum aeger miluus
nec spem uideret esse iam uitae, rogat
cum lacrimis matrem ut sancta circum iret loca
et pro salute magna <dis> promitteret.
'Faciam,' inquit 'fili, quod uis; ut uero impetrem,
uehementer timeo, quando delubra omnia
uastasti et cuncta polluisti altaria
nec sacris temperasti; nunc quid uis precer?'

1 *Multos . . . menses* Gude, *iaceret . . . aeger* is my correction, *aegrotasset* Gude. R gives *miluus cum aegrotaret* (*aegrotare coepisset*) *et multis mensibus iaceret* (but one MS. has *infirmus iaceret nec amplius spem uitae iam esse uideret*).

2 *nec—uitae* my correction, *nec spem uitae suae uideret iam esse* (*iam haberet*) R, *nec iam uideret esse uitae spem suae* Gude. But *suae* (*sibi* Mueller) can be dispensed with and its room is needed for the verse.

2, 3 *rogat—matrem* my correction, *matrem* (*suam*) *cum lacrimis* (one MS. *lacrimando*) *rogabat* R.

ut—loca I have given from R's *ut sancta loca circuiret* (*uisitaret*), *matrem rogabat sancta* (or perhaps *sacra*) *circum iret loca* Gude Mueller, sacrificing *cum lacrimis* and the Phaedrian *ut*.

4 My correction for 'pro salute *illius*' or '*sua*,' (two variants which cut each

other's throats) *magna uota* (*u. m.*) *promitteret* R, *et pro s. uota faceret maxima* Gude (*filii* Mueller). *promittere uota* appears not to be classical. 'dis' was readily omitted, and 'salute' in Phaedrus need have no qualifier.

5 I give *faciam—uis* with the MSS. Gude omits *quod uis*, Mueller *fili* as well.

ut uero impetrem I have given from R's redundant *uerum timeo ne non impetrem, illud enim uereor, nate, et uehementer timeo* (with minor variants), *sed opem ne non impetrem | uehementer uereor* Gude. But *ne non* is merely a substitute for the less obvious *ut*. Compare Ademar's *ut non* for *quin* Fab. III. 4 (*Cl. Quarterly*, *l. c.*, p. 156).

6 *timeo* seems slightly more probable than *uereor*. For the doublet compare *noli timere . . . noli uereri* in P at I. 25. 7.

8 *sacris temperasti* is my correction, *pepercisti sacrificiis* R, *sacrificiis nullis parcens* Gude; but Phaedrus does not use *sacrificium*, and *pepercisti* is an unlikely substitute for *parcens*. For *temperasti* cf. '*temperauit*, *pepercit* abstinuit' *Corp. Gl.* IV. 424. 42 and Livy 1. 29. 6 '*templis* deum *temperatum* est.'

precer is my correction for *ut orem*, Gude *rogem*.

The 'morals' prefixed or appended to this piece have no claim to antiquity.

IX. The Traveller and the Sword.

(Thiele No. XCIV.)

Gladium uiator<forte> uico ut uiderat
iacentem interrogauit 'Quis te perdidit?'
cui telum 'Me quidem unus sed multos ego.'

The Fable is not in Ademar nor in the Weissenburg MS.

1, 2 *forte—iacentem* is my restoration, *dum ambulabat* (*-aret*, *-at*) *iacentem inuenit in uia*. *forte uiderat* is the equivalent in sense of *inuenit*. *in* was an obvious insertion for scribes who stumbled over the Phaedrian use of the simple ablative. *uia* which can hardly stand by *uiator* was an equally easy corruption of *uico*.[1]

quem interrogauit the paraphrasts. Mueller reads for the two lines *Gl. u. media proiectum uia | inuenit et rogauit.*

3 *cui contra telum* (*gladius* one MS.) the paraphrasts, except that one MS. has corrupted further to *cui* tale *contra responsum dedit*. The *contra* which I have omitted is a false Phaedrian reminiscence, as probably also in *App. Perottina* 30. 10.

sed multos ego my correction, *ego uero multos* the paraphrasts, *at plures ego* Mueller. But *sed* follows *quidem* in II. 8. 17, IV. 13. 2. His *plures* is obviously needless.

I would add that I dissent from Havet's condemnation of Mueller's verse on the ground of the elision in caesura.

PHAEDRVS IV. xiv.

The Ape at the Lion's Court.

(Thiele No. LXX.)

Amongst the pieces included in the collections of the paraphrasts the position of IV. xiv. is singular. It is the only instance in which their versions can be called in to supply a considerable gap in the extant manuscripts, or

[1] *Gladium ambulans uiator ut uico inuenit* would be nearer to the letter of the paraphrasts' version, but Thiele appears to be right in saying that '*dum ambularet*, etc.' is a 'superfluous addition of Romulus.'

rather manuscript, of Phaedrus. For the purposes of any restoration it is clearly incumbent on us to compare the manuscript and the paraphrasts in the portion that they have in common.

The subject of the Fable, which is generally, with justice, supposed to be aimed at Caligula and his speedy relapse from the fair promise of the beginning of his principate, is the impossibility of even the most dexterous of flatterers escaping destruction in the court of a tyrant.

The three lines prefixed in the *Pithoeanus* and the lost *Remensis*, and which M. Havet does ill to separate from what follows

> 'Vtilius homini nihil est quam recte loqui'
> probanda cunctis est quidem sententia
> sed ad perniciem solet agi sinceritas

are represented in the Weissenburg version alone, and here in a form displaying the corruption we have so often to deplore in this manuscript, but which must be here reproduced, as in more than one passage of the sequel we shall have to build upon what it offers.

proda (representing *probanda*) autem est *cunctis qui de* hanc re *sententiam sed* sine paenitentia *solet agi sinceritas.*

I have italicized the traceable remains of our mangled poet, preserved for us with ignorant honesty, to which we should perhaps add that *sine paenitentia* may come from *a pernitentia*, a corruption through *sententia* of *ad perniciem*.[1]

The Fable itself opens with the lines given with very slight corruption in P as in R.[2]

> cum se ferarum regem fecisset leo
> et aequitatis uellet famam consequi, 5
> a pristina deflexit consuetudine
> atque inter illas, tenui contentus cibo,
> sancta incorrupta iura reddebat fide.
> postquam labare coepit paenitentia— 9

The noteworthy deviations in the paraphrasts are as follows:

4 Ad. and most of R but not Wiss. make the beasts elect the lion king '*cum sibi ferae regem fecissent*,' and they all add the ornamental epithet *fortissimus*.

5 They add the amplification *more regum* (*regio*). With this exception Wiss. agrees verbally with Phaedrus, the rest have *bonam famam*.

6 They change the to them unusual expression, giving *renuntiauit prioribus factis et mutauit consuetudinem* or the like.

7 They develop the sense here, making the Lion refrain from gratifying his carnivorous appetites, *pecus ullum se non laedere, sine sanguine cibum sumere*. Wiss. alone preserves *contentus* (sine sanguine cibum).

8 They agree in misreading, or misunderstanding, *iura reddebat* as is evidenced by their versions '*sanctam et interruptam* iurauit *se fidem seruare*.'

[1] What are we to say of Herr Thiele's theory that in this and many other instances such correspondences prove interpolation *from* Phaedrus? What does he suppose interpolators are after? Nonsense?

[2] *rege* (l. 1) P, and *lauare* (l. 6) PR (Havet in No. 91, where also the bulk of the material from the paraphrasts is given).

9 A similar corruption is shown by their reproduction '*posteaquam* habere *coepit de hac re paenitentiam*,' which seems a gallant attempt to make something out of some corruption of *labare* in the source.

We will now proceed to reconstruct the sequel as best we can. In our use of the indications we must not omit to observe the character of the reproductions in the different manuscripts. I have space here only to refer to the contrast which the editing of the material in the *Recensio Vetus* presents to the crass but simple ignorance of the Weissenburg MS. I take one example out of a number which may be gathered from Thiele. The word that Phaedrus uses for 'ape' is *simius*, and accordingly in v. 15 below the animal is called *laudator*. But in common parlance (compare It. *scimmia*, Fr. *singe*) the noun was feminine: and in the *Vetus* not only does *simia* appear throughout but *laudator* is altered to *laudatrix*. Ademar, on the other hand, gives *simia*, but keeps *laudator*.

Including the unfinished sentence with which the direct tradition breaks off, the piece may be reconstituted from the indications of the indirect somewhat as follows:

postquam labare coepit paenitentia,
durando ingenium nec iam poterat uincere,
occepit aliquot in secretum ducere
osque an sibi feteret fallax quaerere;
quis, uerum siue dicerent mendacium,
laniatis cunctis se saturabat sanguine.
hoc multis cum fecisset, uenit ad simium.
idem is rogatus cinnamomo suauius
fragrare os dixit ac deorum altaribus.
leo, hunc qui erubuit laudatorem laedere,
fidem ut mutaret, finxit sese languidum.
concurrunt undecumque medicorum genus,
tactis qui uenis pulsum {sanum / infandum} ut uiderunt,
fastidium leuantem suaserunt cibum,
cuncta ut licent tyrannis. at leo 'Simii
sapor mihist ignotus; hanc carnem uelim.'
atque ita locuto blandus rapitur simius.

The authorities for this piece are Ad., which stops in the middle of v. 16, R and Wiss. It is among the *Nouae Fabulae* of Mueller, but few of his proposals are of use for the restoration of the original.

10 My corrections. R generally and Wiss. give us a weak and trivial paraphrase, *et mutare non potuit* (*posset*) *naturam*. Ademar provides a clue by adding *patientia*. Impossible, it is true, after *paenitentia*, but pointing to *durando* (the collocation *durando uincere* occurs in Vergil *G.* II. 295). The obvious sense is that the Lion's penitence soon gave way, unable to hold out against his native instincts. Mueller writes *mutare quia naturam non poterat suam*, the chief objection to which is that it takes no account of Ad.

11 *coepit aliquos ducere in secretum* (*-o*) Ad R, Wiss. having *singulos.* I write *occepit*, corrupted to *coepit* as at III. 16. 7 (but preserved there by NV) and, with Mueller, *aliquot*, which Phaedrus uses more than once.

12 The paraphrasts *et fallacia* (*ut falleret* one MS.) *quaerere* (*ab eis*) *si*(*an*) *ei os puteret* or *feteret* (*an os foetens haberet* Ad.). To decide between *puteret* or *feteret* is far from easy.

13 My restoration is based on Wiss. *uerum mendacium dicente* (for *-es*). The readings of the rest are obviously attempts to make things plainer, e g. *illos qui dicebant putet et qui dicebant non putet* R (the *Vetus* more artistically *tam eas quae negabant quam quae confitebantur*).

14 *omnes* (*tamen*) *laniabat ita ut saturaretur sanguine* (et *saturabatur eorum carnibus* Ad.). Ad. R Wiss. is defective.

15 *haec*, or *hoc*, *cum multis fecisset* (*faceret*) Ad. R Wiss.

uenit ad simium is given by *Vetus*, which adds *interrogans* (below), *postea simium interrogabat* R. *uenit ad s.* is wrongly understood by Thiele in a literal sense: he accepts the *uocat simiam ad se*, *interrogat* of Ad. for his reconstruction of the prose of the *Recensio Gallicana.*

16 *idem is rogatus* again is based on the *Vetus* '*interrogans eam simili modo.*' The rest have tasteless expansions as Ad. *si putidum haberet os*, Wiss. *si foetitum haberet os.*

cinnamomo suauius is from Ad., (*quasi*) *cinnamomum* (*cinnamum*) the rest.

17 The paraphrasts are divided between *fragrare* and *olere.* Compare v. 12 and note on VIII. 6 above.

et deorum altaribus Mueller, *et quasi d. altaria* the paraphrasts.

18 *leo autem* (*uero* Ad.) *laudatorem erubuit laedere* or *ut laederet* Ad. R. My *hunc* (indispensable) has some support in Wiss. *tunc erit* (all that is left of *erubuit*).

19 *fidem ut mutaret* which I have written is variously corrupted and amplified (by doublets) in the paraphrasts; *ut deciperet, mutauit fidem* et *quaesiuit fraudem, fidem irrumpens* (the *Vetus*), *aue*<*n*>*s fraude*<*m*> Wiss., *cum sederet* (? *l.*) *mutauit fidem* Ad.

finxit sese languidum I have based on Wiss. *esse fincxit languidum; languere se*, or *languorem simulabat* R more obvious expressions, but cf. Seneca *Benef.* 4. 17. 3 '*bonos* se ac liberales fingunt.'

20 *concurrunt* my conjecture, *continuo querunt* Wiss., *cont. uenerunt* R. The correction of the rest of the line is based on Wiss. '*medici* [*potius clini*] *uberi* (from *ubi erant*) *passim ullique* (from *undique*) *genus.*' Thiele has seen that in the bracketed words *clinici* is concealed; *potius* means 'say rather,' the words being a reader's comment on *medici.* Thiele also suggests *ubi erat* (*passio*). But *passim undique* forms a substitute, or substitutes, for the rare *undecumque.* For the Phaedrian plural with *genus* cf. III. 10. 24 '*dum concursant* familia.'

21 Restored largely from Wiss. *t a n t i s autem u e n i u s erat pulsus i n e n a r r a b i l i s*, but R contributes also *q u i ut u e n a s considerauerunt pulsum sanum u t u i d e r u n t.* For more on this and the next line see below.

22 R gives *suaserunt ei sumere cibum aliquem qui leuis esset et tolleret fastidium pro digestione* (the *Vetus* '*cibum solutionis*', scilicet *stomachi* as Pliny), Wiss. *suadetur sumere cibum aliquem in quietem et qui ei leuaret fastidium. suadere cibum* is to be compared with *suadere pacem, parsimoniam*, etc., *cibus* being almost a verbal substantive. See the examples in the *Thesaurus* III. 1041.

23 *cuncta—tyrannis* = *ut regibus omnia lice*(*n*)*t* Wiss. R (omitted in the *Vetus*); the sentiment being general, the oratio recta is allowed. For *tyrannus* cf. I. 2. 5, V. 1. 14.

at leo (accepted by Thiele) one of the R MSS., with *ut—licent* following, the rest *ille* or *at ille* (omitted by Wiss.). All add *inquit.*

24 *ignota est mihi inquid simii caro. hanc uellem ignoro quid sit hanc* (*l. hic*) *sapor* Wiss., *ign. e. inq. mihi c. simii* (*-ae* the *Vetus*), *uellem hanc probare* R (the *Vetus* adding *si bene uerteretur*). For the *simii sapor* cf. III. 4. 3 sq.

25 *ut est locutus* R Wiss., which is metrically possible, but the practice of Phaedrus is to qualify *locutus* with *sic* or *ita* (*atque ita locutus* I. 22. 9).

The rendering of the conclusion by the paraphrasts is most instructive. *statim necatur beniloquus simius* R (*simia boniloquax* the *Vetus*), *statim rapuit* (fr. *rapitur*) *bene loquens simius* offeretur (corruption of *aufertur*, a doublet of *rapitur*) *ut regi erat iussum* (indication of the case of *locuto*) *et statim laniatus ab eo* (a paraphrast's amplification) Wiss. A different addition in R (except the *Vetus*) *ut eius carnem cito in escam sumeret.* The various late Latin substitutes for *blandus* are noteworthy. At the end R, not Wiss., gives *una enim* (*et ita una* the *Vetus*) *poena est loquentis et non loquentis* (*tacentis* the *Vetus*).

The discrepancy between R and Wiss. as to the adjective of *pulsus* in v. 19 raises an interesting question. There seems little doubt that Phaedrus's narration is coloured by conscious or unconscious reminiscence of one of the best-known tales of medical insight in ancient times, which has left its mark even on so late a composition as the *Aegritudo Perdicae* (Baehrens *P.L.M.* V. 112 sqq.), the similarity of which to our passage is noted by Thiele.[1] How Erasistratus, the physician of Seleucus Nicator, detected the wasting passion of the king's son Antiochus for Stratonice, his father's wife, the beautiful daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes, we know from accounts and allusions in many writers; see e.g. the article 'Erasistratus,' in Pauly-Wissowa or Smith's Dictionary of Biography. Here I need only quote what may throw light upon the meaning or expressions of Phaedrus.

Erasistratus, it is said, discovered the truth, which the prince had done his best to conceal, by the change in the patient's physical condition when the Queen entered the sick chamber, including all the symptoms of violent affection described in the famous ode of Sappho, *ἐγίνετο τὰ τῆς Σαπφοῦς ἐκεῖνα περὶ αὐτὸν πάντα, φωνῆς ἐπίσχεσις, ἐρύθημα πυρῶδες, ὄψεων ὑπολείψεις, ἱδρῶτες ὀξεῖς, ἀταξία καὶ θόρυβος ἐν τοῖς σφυγμοῖς*, Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 39; 'intrante enim Stratonice et rursus abeunte brachium adulescentis dissimulanter adprehendendo *modo uegetiore modo languidiore pulsu uenarum* comperit cuius morbi aeger esset,' Valerius Maximus V. vii. Ext. 1; *Aegritudo Perdicae*, 143 sqq. (the doctors summoned to prescribe for Perdica's malady), 'inueniunt iuuenem postrema clade grauatum | et primum quaerunt quae causa laboris inesset; | post *uena* est temptata; sed haec *pulsus*que quietus': ib. 167 sqq., 'ingreditur mater. tum quae fuit ante tenenti | mitis et in lentos motus aequaliter acta, | improbiter digitos quatiens *pulsatibus* urguet.' Now what does the sardonic fabulist intend us to understand was the state of the Lion's pulse when it was felt (tactis uenis[2]) by His Majesty's medical advisers? Was it beating wildly with the desire and the prospect of immediate gratification, the lust of blood in the monarch (who, it should be remembered, typifies the most sanguinary of tyrants, Commodus excepted, that ever ruled over the Roman world) being excited to uncontrollable fury by the actual

1 'Die Konsultation wird mit ähnlichen Ausdrücken in der Aegritudo Perdicae 169 beschrieben womöglich nach gemeinsamer Vorlage,' p. 241.

2 Cf. Pers. *S.* 3. 107 sq. '*tange* miser *uenas*.'

presence of its object? If so, we shall accept the *infandum* which underlies the *inenarrabilis* of Wiss.; compare the gloss 'infandum. inenarrandum nec eloquendum,' *Corp. Gl.* IV. 525, 41. *infandus* then will express with greater intensity the same idea as 'improbus' *Aegritudo Perdicae* l.c. *improbiter;* Lucan 1. 629 '(fibrarum) pars micat et celeri *uenas* mouet *improba pulsu.*' In this case R's *sanum* is explicable either as a conscious alteration of something beyond the knowledge and comprehension of the scribe, or as a corruption due to the omission of *in* after 'pulsu*m*,' a phenomenon common enough in MSS. of Phaedrus (see *Classical Quarterly* XII. p. 91), and the slight change of the resulting *fādum* to *fanum.*

There is however another possibility; which, it must be admitted, leaves the reading of Wiss. unaccounted for. Phaedrus may have written 'pulsum *sanum,*' as R have given. Then there was no fever in the Lion's pulse, and what his physicians were asked to prescribe for was 'loss of appetite' ('fastidium'), which had to be removed by a tempting chance of diet. If so, the situation would be parallel to an earlier incident in Erasistratus's conduct of his case, Appian *Syriaca* 59, *οὐδ' ὁ περιώνυμος ἰατρὸς Ερασίστρατος . . . εἶχε, τεκμήρασθαι τοῦ πάθους μέχρι φυλάξας καθαρὸν ἐκ πάντων τὸ σῶμα εἴκασεν εἶναι τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν νόσον.* Compare *Aegr. Perd.* 156, '*non* isti *calor* est *pulsus nec uena minatur*' and following lines. I leave the decision to the reader.

One concluding remark. It looks as though in the words *cuncta ut licent tyrannis*, which I gather from Thiele some of the paraphrasts not unnaturally connect with the Lion's subsequent behaviour (25), Phaedrus had given an evil twist to a thought which appeared in the current account of the Stratonice incident. Compare what we find in Appian op. cit. 60 init. *Σελεύκου δὲ θαυμάσαντος εἴ τινα μὴ δύναιτο πεῖσαι Σέλευκος ὁ τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλεύς.*

Before leaving the subject perhaps I had better add a word to obviate a possible misunderstanding by readers of the *Classical Quarterly* who are not acquainted with Herr Thiele's work. Its object is not to restore the text of lost poems of Phaedrus, but to reconstitute a medieval collection of prose fables, in which were included amongst others a number of pieces based on the work of the fabulist; and, when I speak of his 'accepting' a reading, this is to be understood to mean that he 'accepts' it for the original text of this collection.

I take the opportunity of adding some passages in support of two readings I have given in the *Fabulae* already published in this *Journal.*

IV. 4. (*Class. Quart.* XII. p. 156) *securi aptato* (manubrio). Compare Pliny *N. H.* 18. 236, 'manubria aptare,' Columella 11. 2. 92.

Phaedrus uses the verb with a dative in IV. 15. 7.

V. 2. *glandem cenat.* For this expression compare Seneca, Phaedrus's contemporary, *Dial.* 1. 3. 6, 'ad focum cenat illas ipsas *radices et herbas.*'

J. P. POSTGATE.

LIVERPOOL,
December 21, 1918.

NOTE ON 'CONSPICIOR' IN LIV. X. 43.

In connexion with the note on *conspicior*, Liv. X. 43, in the last volume of *Classical Quarterly*, pp. 116 ff., where it is argued that this verb often conveys a suggestion of self-conscious feeling, it may be interesting to remark the use of *conspectus* in *Aen.* VIII. 588:

ipse agmine Pallas
in medio, chlamyde et pictis *conspectus* in armis.

The suggestion of self-consciousness would, I think, be very appropriate here. The young warrior in his splendid armour attracts everyone's attention, and is proudly conscious of the fact—a touch of human nature quite in Vergil's manner. I am not aware whether editors have drawn any attention to this point, but it seems worth noticing.

G. J. Clemens.

Gordon Schools, Huntly,
Aberdeenshire.

CORRIGENDA.

In Mr. F. H. Colson's article on 'The Analogist and Anomalist Controversy (*C. Q.*, January, 1919, pp. 24-36) the following corrections should be made:

P. 27, note 5. Read '*Ib.* VIII. 42.'
P. 28, line 12 from foot. For συλλαβῶν read συμφώνον.
P. 28, note 4. For παραλήγουσα read παρατέλευτος.

REMARKS ON THE CORPUS GLOSSARY.

I.—THE ALDHELM PROBLEM.

IN the Introduction to his *Old English Glosses*, published in 1900, the late Professor Napier asserted that Aldhelm glosses are to be found in the Corpus Glossary. He did not attempt any elaborate argument, but contented himself with giving a list of sixty-four instances in which the lemmata of the Corpus Glossary (none of the words, it is important to remark, being in the normal dictionary form, but all in inflexional forms differing from this) coincide entirely (i.e., including the inflexions) with words occurring in the text of the *De Virginitate*.[1] Of these lemmata, twenty-three occur also in the Epinal and Erfurt Glossaries, and must therefore have existed in the common archetype of the three collections. Napier's conclusion was that the compiler of the archetype had before him one Aldhelm glossary, and that the author of the Corpus Glossary, who rearranged the material of the archetype and made extensive additions, had among his sources another and an independent glossary.

This conclusion has been all but universally accepted, and I do not think it can possibly be denied that at first sight the evidence in its favour must appear overwhelming. For the selected lemmata, not being in dictionary form, must have been taken ultimately from one or more consecutive glossed texts; and when we find that no fewer than sixty-four of the words, in their precise inflexional form, accur in the *De Virginitate*, it is difficult to resist the conviction that, even though a good many of the coincidences may be accidental, it is certain that the number of Aldhelm items in the Corpus Glossary is not very small.

I have recently learned, however, that at least two highly competent scholars, who have given special attention to the Corpus Glossary, have come to the opinion that there is little or no real evidence that the collection contains any Aldhelm glosses at all. Now, although I decidedly believe that Napier's argument, after all deductions are made, retains sufficient force to establish the existence of an Aldhelmian element in the Glossary, I have no difficulty in understanding how it may be possible for a qualified and careful investigator to arrive at a different conclusion. An inspection of Napier's list shows at once that many of the words enumerated are not very uncommon in the literature of the seventh century and earlier periods, occurring in texts or glossaries to

[1] I adopt this form of the title of the prose treatise, in order to prevent confusion in the references with the metrical *De Laudibus Virginum*.

which the compiler of the Corpus Glossary and the compiler of the archetype of the portions common to Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus unquestionably had access. Further, the coincidences in inflexion, on which Napier (quite rightly, in my opinion) lays especial stress, lose much of their evidential force when we reflect that not seldom the particular oblique case or verbal form cited is the very shape in which the word is likely to have most frequently occurred. And even when one of the words in Napier's list is excessively rare, or (as in one or two instances) has hitherto been found in no other text than the *De Virginitate*, we must remember that Aldhelm above all other men was an amateur of lexical rarities, and is likely to have industriously sought for them in the very sources that were used by the compilers of our glossaries. Lastly, I believe there is no doubt that now and then a lemma of the Corpus Glossary which shows a striking coincidence with a word in Aldhelm's treatise is found, in the same inflected form, in some other text which *a priori* is at least equally likely to have been the source. I hope it will not be deemed impertinent to suggest that the investigation that has led to the negative conclusion has not been wholly unbiassed. This involves no reproach, because, on account of certain chronological difficulties to which I shall afterwards advert, some degree of negative bias on this question is not only excusable but justifiable. However this may be, when a person has gone carefully through a long series of alleged items of evidence, and found that individually they have very little weight, it is not easy for him to do justice to the cumulative value they may possess; he 'cannot see the wood for the trees.' I am inclined to think that the verdict of a strictly impartial person, who had nothing before him but Napier's list of coincidences, might be that, while the existence of a considerable Aldhelmian element in the Glossary may be accepted as proved, it would be difficult to show dependence on Aldhelm for more than a very few individual lemmata.

Beyond this not very satisfactory conclusion we can hardly hope to advance, unless some new method of attacking the problem can be discovered. Such a method it is the object of this paper to suggest and to apply.

The starting-point of my inquiry was the document printed in Wright-Wülcker 485^{30}—535^{11} (the third part of the MS. Cleopatra, A iii.),[1] to which I shall refer hereafter as 'Cleop.' It is a glossary to Aldhelm, not alphabetical nor classified, but following the order in which the words occur in the Latin text.

This Aldhelm glossary affords a solution (which to me appears beyond reasonable doubt) of one of the most hopeless-looking puzzles in the Corpus Glossary—the entry A 580, 'Anastasis: dilignessum.' It has been widely recognized that the OE. word must be a corruption of *digelnessum*, dat. pl. of *digelness*, secret place; but why this word should be given as a rendering of *anastasis* is a question which no one has hitherto been able to answer, though the gloss 'De recessibus: . . . of digelnessum,' in the Digby MS. of Aldhelm, did look

[1] This MS., in addition to the valuable Aldhelm glossary which I cite as Cleop., contains the alphabetical glossary WW., 338—472, with which I am not here concerned. It is highly important that the two should not be confused.

tantalizingly suggestive of a clue. To my great surprise, I found that Cleop. has the lemma *de recessibus* (though with a different gloss) in a section headed *De Anastasio* (this is really an absurd blunder for *De Athanasio*;[1] but the error does not affect the present point). It now appears that one of the sources of Corpus was a MS. of Aldhelmian *glossae collectae*, similar in general character to Cleop. In this MS. the top line of a page was 'De recessibus : of digelnessum,' preceded in the margin by the name Anastasius, in order to save the user of the glossary the trouble of turning back. The compiler of Corpus mistook the saint's name for the well-known word *anastasis*, which he supposed to be the lemma. As the line was inconveniently long, he thought that since there was an English gloss the Latin one might be dispensed with, and he therefore omitted *de recessibus;* and finally, by a kind of slip which is extremely common in glossaries of the period, he turned *digelnessum* into *dilignessum*.

If this solution be accepted, the conclusion is inevitable that at least one item in the Corpus Glossary was obtained from *glossae collectae* relating to the section of the *De Virginitate* concerned with Athanasius—the second half of chapter xxxii. We have now to ask whether any other Corpus lemmata are derived from the same portion of Aldhelm's text. The number of correspondences between words in this section of Aldhelm and words glossed in Corpus is at any rate surprisingly large, whatever their evidential value may turn out to be. I will give a list, divided into two groups, of the words occurring in this section which are found (*α*) in the oldest part of the collection (viz., the portion common to the Corpus, Epinal, and First Erfurt Glossaries), and (*β*) in the additions peculiar to Corpus. I print in italics those words which appear in identical oblique or inflected form in the two places, using roman type for those which have the dictionary form in Corpus, whatever shape the word may have in Aldhelm. It should be remarked that in the Corpus Glossary the normal dictionary form of a verb was not *amo* or *amare*, but *amat;* and that for adjectives in *-us*, *-a*, *-um* the neuter was often taken as the typical form. Also, an inflected feminine adjective is often represented in the Glossary by the nom. sing. fem.

(*α*) palmitibus, *percrebruit*, glareis, serio, strophas, *commentis*, inlectus, stibio, mancum, penitus, insimulare, testudine, aemulorum, torquebantur.

(*β*) rumigerula, praeconia, cardines, altor, *cunabulorum* (cur- in Cp.), *characteres*, commate, ilia, abstrusum, latrinae, cuniculum, tropeo, fastigio, aetatula, *indolis*, prodigio, inuestes (= beardless), portenderit, decretis, *insontem*, subdola, *factione*, concinnabant, euulsum, adstipulatur, *sceptra*, *lacertum*, *sarcofago*, necromantia, *probrosis*, inmunem, reatum, facinoribus, sospitem, neruorum, nexibus, huiuscemodi, confutati, molientes, comminiscuntur, prostituta, pellax, prostibuli, stupro, pubertate, machinaretur, garrulitatis, incestum (subst.), ulnarum, gremiis, procax, *defenditur*, profugus, *intercapedine*, latebra, potiretur, adamante, rigidiore, inrogabat.

Now I am quite aware that this list must be taken with the same kind of reserves as I have admitted to be necessary in estimating the value of Napier's

[1] The blunder, strange to say, recurs in the portion of Cleop. dealing with the corresponding section of the poetical *De Laudibus Virginum*. From the apparatus criticus in Ehwald's edition, it appears not to be found in any extant MS. of Aldhelm.

list of correspondences between Corpus and the whole text of the *De Virginitate;* indeed, with far greater reserves, because all but a very few of the words above quoted appear in Corpus in their dictionary form, and not in the inflected forms in which they occur in Aldhelm. In all probability very many of the coincidences are accidental. But, after all, when we find that 14+59=73 lemmata of Corpus are identical with words occurring in a single section[1] of Aldhelm which occupies 41 lines in Ehwald's edition—a section, moreover, which we know to have furnished *one* item to the Corpus Glossary—there does seem an excess of scepticism in refusing the inference that the obligations of Corpus to glosses on this section are probably somewhat considerable. It may be quite true that not one of these 73 lemmata can be confidently affirmed to have come from this source; but it is equally true that there is not one of them for which such an origin can with absolute certainty be denied. A good many of the words seem to have been special favourites of Aldhelm; but while this diminishes the probability that a Corpus item is a gloss on this particular chapter, it only strengthens the general likelihood of its being an Aldhelm gloss.

Before I proceed further with this method of argument, I wish to interject the remark that the contention that a particular item in Corpus is an Aldhelm gloss is not necessarily disproved, or even rendered less likely, by showing that the explanation is taken from some lexicographical work older than the seventh century, and that it was suggested by some particular context in an ancient writer. For the glossators on Aldhelm did not draw their explanations from the stores of their own learning. When a glossator was not acquainted with a word which it was his duty to explain, and did not (as he too often did) venture to guess its meaning from the context, he would naturally look it up in a dictionary. The compiler of Corpus, incorporating in his work the *glossae collectae* on Aldhelm, would inevitably include many explanations which, if we did not know their intermediate source, we might suppose him to have copied directly from the ancient vocabularies in which we find them. Aldhelm himself, for all we know, may have learnt the Latin words from these same ancient vocabularies, which were among the school-books of his youth; or he may himself have read and remembered the passages on which the explanations were founded. For our purpose it does not matter how Aldhelm got hold of the words. Anyhow, he introduced them in his text, and the glossators had to explain them as best they could. There are at least five more or less independent sets of glosses on the *De Virginitate.* Three of these are extant: one is interlined in MS. Digby 146; the second in other MSS. used by Napier; the third is preserved in Cleop. We shall find reason to believe that there were two

[1] To preclude a possible misapprehension, I may point out that the misunderstood *Anastasius* in the Aldhelmian *glossae collectae* used in Corpus was not the heading of the section (if it had been that it would have been *De Anastasio*), but a catchword at the top left-hand corner of a page, indicating that the section is continued from the preceding page. Instead, therefore, of proving that 'De recessibus: of digelnessum' was the first item of the section, and thus ruling out most of the correspondences noted above, this catchword really proves just the contrary. In Cleop., it may be remarked, 'De recessibus' comes twenty-sixth in the section.

others (mainly independent, but showing occasional points of contact, which it is not easy to account for, with Digby or with Cleop.). One of these was used, somewhat sparingly, in the archetype of the common portion of Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus; the other, much more extensively, in the additions made by the redactor of Corpus. I find no reason to believe that the redactor obtained any of his material *directly* from the ancient vocabularies. He had, indeed, no motive for doing so. His purpose was evidently to produce such a dictionary as would be useful to students of the texts ordinarily read—the Bible, Virgil, some of the Fathers, Orosius, Aldhelm, and others. For this practical end all the material he was likely to need was to be found in glossed MSS., or collections of glosses on these authors. If he had tried to supplement this material by selections from ancient vocabularies, he would have been at a loss what items to choose. Perhaps he might have gone on the principle of taking such words as he did not happen to understand; but then he would be in danger of wasting space on curiosities like *topper* and *antigerio*, which nobody would by any possibility meet with in his reading. And that he had a business-like anxiety not to waste his space is apparent from several indications. Thus, when he has given a gloss on a primary word, he does not usually add the obvious derivatives; he will give you the meaning of *alga*, but will leave to your own wit to infer that of *algosus*, though the latter occurs in a chapter of Aldhelm from which (I may be allowed to anticipate here) he has taken every gloss that was likely to be useful. It is true that he often by inadvertence repeats a gloss once or even twice; but as his arrangement is alphabetical only for the first two letters of a word, this mistake was not easy to avoid, and he had not the modern resource of correcting blunders in proof.

My reason for beginning with the section *De Athanasio* was that it had been the starting-point of my own investigations; not at all that I believed it to afford a particularly good sample of the evidence on which my conclusion is based. Indeed, there are very many other sections which seem to be much more likely to force conviction on an unwilling mind. Of course it is possible for me to give only a few examples. It will perhaps be less tedious and more effective if in what follows I adopt a different mode of presentation. I will in the first place copy out one or two passages of Aldhelm, confronting them with the Corpus glosses on the words which they contain. I quote from the edition by Ehwald in the *MGH.*, but give reference to page and line of Giles's edition:

CH. XXVI.

30^{10}. nec pudeat, Christi *caelibes* strictis[1] pudicitiae legibus	N 337	Celebs. sine uxore uir
lasciuam naturae petulantiam coartantes corporeosque	(P 226	Petulans. lasciuus.)
titillationum *gestus* uelut *indomitos bigarum* subiugales	G 41	Gestus. gebero (*plural*)
	I 427	Indomitus. welde
	B 115	Bigae. ubi duo equi curru subiunguntur

[1] I do not italicize this word, because S 536, Strictis: getogenum,' although it *is* an Aldhelm gloss, belongs to 'strictis mucronibus' in 52^{15}.

ferratis *saliuaribus* refrenantes Toronici reminisci	S 44	Salibaribus. miðlum
pontificis; quem antequam . . . baptismatis *rudimenta*	Int. 251	Pontifex. episcopus
	R 217	Rudimenta. initia. tirocinia
cognosceret, in *catacuminorum* gradu et competentium	C 74	Catecominus. deforis audiens
statu *stipem* pauperculis porrigentem	S 511	Stipem. elemosinam
*agapem*que egentibus	A 405	Agapem. suoesendo
erogantem, . . . caeleste beauit *oraculum*, quique pro	O 241	Oraculum. responsum. diuinitus
adepta integritatis corona et *fausta* uirginitatis *infula*,	A 197	Adeptus. adsecutus
	F 6	Faustus. iocundus
	I 98	Infula. uueorðmynd
quas uelut regale *diadema* ac gemmatas *crepundiorum*	D 221	Diadema. uit<t>a regalis
	C 889	Crepundium. monile gutturis
lunulas indefessis uiribus *meta* tenus seruare *satagebat*,	L 277	Lunulus (*read* -as). mene. scillingas
	M 127	Meta. finis
	S 61	Satagit. deliberat. cogitat. uel omnia peragit
miris uirtutum signis effulsisse memoratur.		

Ch. LII.

68[27]. praedictas uirgines nulla persecutorum *rabies*,	R 16	Rabies. geris
nulla poenarum *acerbitas* ab integritatis *arce*	A 164	Aceruitas. dolor. crudelitas
	A 792	Arce. eminentia
detrudere ualuerunt, sed omne *patrimonium*	D 169	Detrudit. excludit
	P 2	Patrimonium. gestrion
et ornamentorum gloriam tam *discriminalia capitum*	D 301	Discriminalia. capitis ornamentum
et *periscelides crurum* quum *olfactoriola nardi*	P 330	Periscelidus. crurum ornatus
	O 140	Olfactoriola. uasa. insimilae
	N 28	Nardus. genus odoris optimi
et *crepundia* collo gemmiferis *lunulis* pendentia	C 887	Crepundia. maenoe.
	N 277	Lunulus. mene. scillingas
ad *stipem mancis* et matriculariis *prodiga*	S 510	Stipem. elemosinam
	M 8	Mancus. anhendi
	P 583	Prodigus. profusus. largus.
liberalitate contulerunt.	L 244	Liberalitas. roopnis

As in illustration of the first of these two extracts I have taken one gloss from the 'Interpretatio,' I may remark here that the two works composing the Corpus Glossary, the 'Interpretatio Nominum' and the 'Glosa,' were probably prepared concurrently, and that (both works being arranged alphabetically) the compiler several times inadverently inserted an item in the wrong collection.[1]

But I really must get on more rapidly. I will now give, in as summary a

[1] I have not fully investigated the relation between the second and third Erfurt Glossaries and the Corpus Glossary. My provisional hypothesis with regard to this allows me to treat the entries common to these glossaries and Corpus as on the same level with those peculiar to Corpus; and I do not think any error can result from my doing so.

fashion as possible, a few more illustrations of the extraordinarily great extent to which the vocabulary of the treatise *De Virginitate* is to be found in the Corpus Glossary.

Chapter I. of Giles's edition is in the *MGH.* edition printed in large capitals as a prologue or dedication, and there occupies eleven lines. Fifteen of the words it contains are explained in the words in the Corpus Glossary; several more are used to explain other words, so that we may presume the glossator thought them too well known to need explanation. This chapter or dedication, by the way, is left unglossed both in MS. Digby and in Cleop.

Chapter II. of Giles's edition (=I. and II. *MGH.*) fills 26 lines in *MGH.*, and 71 of its words are glossed in Corpus, not including several which appear in the Glossary in inflexional forms other than those found in this chapter. These latter presumably come from non-Aldhelmian sources, but when they had been once inserted the compiler would of course not repeat them. The words *flagris* and *portisculo* show coincidence in an oblique case; the latter is especially significant.

Chapter IV. occupies in *MGH.* 33 lines, and includes 74 words that are explained in Corpus, which has the following in their inflected forms: *corimbos, cnucleata, anagogen, cola, commata, pentemimerin, eptemimerin.* Among those which in Corpus appear in their dictionary form are *catalecticus, brachicatalecticus, altrinsecus, allegoria, tropologia, tonus* (glossed 'accentus').

For a last example of the results of this sort of statistical comparison I chose at random Chapter XX., which occupies 25 lines, and has 42 words glossed as Corpus. Inflected forms in this chapter which are retained in Corpus are *secreti, membrorum, in propatulo.* Among the lemmata of Corpus represented in the chapter by inflected forms are such words as *penticontarchus, exametron, uectigal, explodet, gannatura, insultans, subiocat, incunabulum, promulgat* (MS.—*it.*).

The list of words in the *De Virginitate* which are likely to have required glosses, and are absent from the Corpus Glossary, would comparatively be extremely short. The man who (knowing the peculiar character of Aldhelm's vocabulary) can believe this to be the effect of chance can believe anything. Of course the greatest weight as evidence belongs to the instances in which a lemma of Corpus which is not in dictionary form coincides inflexionally with a word used by Aldhelm. Of these Professor Napier adduced 64, and though most of the items in his list have only a cumulative value, this objection hardly applies to such examples as *archiatros, indruticans, mirifillo, saliuaribus, stricta macerā,* and several others. But Napier's list was confined to words that have OE. glosses in Corpus, and even within its limits made no pretence of being exhaustive. It could be very extensively supplemented; and some of the items omitted are perhaps more striking than any of those included. I will cite only two: 'Exalaparetur suungen<waere>' (=Giles 58^{4}), and 'Taxauerat. gierende' (=Giles 27^{14}). One might almost let the case for the existence of Aldhelm glosses in Corpus rest on the evidence of these two specimens alone. The dictionaries give only one reference for *exalapo;* the Latin *Thesaurus,* when it

reaches the word, may produce more, but I do not think the examples of the 3rd sing. subj. impf. passive will be numerous. *Taxo* is common enough, but *taxauerat* is surely rare. Aldhelm's use of the verb in the passage referred to is somewhat peculiar. He says, in effect: 'If Clement even in his heathen days had so greatly valued (*tantopere taxauerat*) the virtue of chastity, how much more may we expect that when he had become a Christian he would be a shining example of it!' The word was a stumbling-block to A. Gronovius, whose proposed reading *dilexerat* is very bad as a textual correction, but a very good shot at the contextual sense. The meaning of the OE. gloss *gierende* has been much disputed, but I think the source shows that it stands for *giernde*, equivalent to Gronovius's *dilexerat*; the glossator of MS. Digby 146 adopts the commonplace explanation 'iudicauerat,' which does not well suit the context; what Cleop. means by its rendering 'figurabat' I do not clearly understand.

It may perhaps have occurred to the reader that if the Corpus Glossary abounds in Aldhelm glosses to the extent that I suppose, we ought sometimes to meet with a consecutive series of them, approximately in the order in which they occur in the text. The test seems fair enough, and perhaps no one will deny that if it is successfully borne a point will have been scored for my contention. Too much must not be expected, for the arrangement being alphabetical for the first two letters of a word and not for the initial only, there will not often be room for very long batches of words from the same source, and allowance must be made for transpositions and afterthoughts. I have not thoroughly studied this question, but the following example of consecution could hardly be bettered. (I give the numbers of the Corpus items in Hessels' edition, and references to page and line of Giles's edition of Aldhelm.)

S 41	Sagax. gleu.	2^{13}	sagaces gimnosofistas
42	Salpicum. tubarum	23^{3}	salpicum clangor
43	Sarmentum. spraec.	23^{5}	sarmentorumque nutrimine
44	Salibaribus. miðlum	30^{13}	saliuaribus refrenantes
45	Sarcofago. licbeorg	39^{27}	in sarcofago
46	Sacellorum. haerga	25^{38}	sacellorum lustramenta
47	Salamandra. animal quod<d>am uiuens in igne	42^{23}	salamandras, quas . . . prunarum globi cremare nequeunt

In this sequence of seven glosses only one is out of place. I may add that the two preceding lemmata, S 39 *saliunca*, and S 40 *salix*, are words used by Aldhelm, but as they occur in his verse, and as the glosses come from the archetype, and not, as do the following seven, from the redactor of Corpus, they are irrelevant to my argument.

Although I have not attempted to present more than a small portion of the evidence, I venture to hope that impartial readers are now satisfied that glosses on the *De Virginitate* are abundant in the Corpus Glossary. It remains to determine whether, as at the outset of my investigation I expected to find, they are almost entirely confined to the additions made by the latest redactor, or whether, as Napier thought, they exist in considerable number in the original

nucleus represented by Epinal and Erfurt. I have no longer any doubt that Napier was right. The Aldhelm glosses in the archetype are less numerous than those in the additions, but they are far more abundant than I expected.

The investigation of this question must be based not on the Corpus but on the Epinal Glossary, which substantially represents the original work without the later additions and transpositions. In my references to the Epinal Glossary, the roman numeral stands for the page of the facsimile, the letters *a*, *b*, *c* severally for the three (double) columns, and the arabic figures for the numbers of the gloss in the column.[1]

In the A section of the Epinal Glossary I find about 30 lemmas, and in the B section about 10, which are identical with words used by Aldhelm. These items, however, seem to me so inconclusive, that I am led to surmise that the compiler either had not access to the Aldhelm glosses, or did not make up his mind to use them, until he had completed the B section. When we come to the letter C the case is completely altered. At the very beginning we come upon a long series of glosses consisting, with rare exceptions, of explanations of words used by Aldhelm. It is true that they are not arranged in the order in which the words occur in the text; and although there are signs that the compiler of the archetype of the three glossaries had made some re-arrangement of his material, including sporadic attempts at classification according to affinities of meaning, this is unquestionably a very serious abatement from the value of my argument (see my Postscript). I will now give the first 25 entries in the C section, with references to the page and line of Giles's edition of Aldhelm:

VI. *c.* 14	<I>conisma: picta imago.	81^{11} iconisma
15	Colonus; gibuur.	10^{36} (and elsewhere) colonus
16	Cellis: apothecis	(A Virgil gloss: see Servius on *Geo.* II. 96)
17	Contribulus: meeg	2^{31} contribulium. 38^{21} contribulibus
18	Cistulla: sporta	
19	Calcis: finis	65^{12} ante calcem uoluminis
20	Calculus: calc	138^{20} calculus ardens
21	Clibosum: clibecti	
22	Constillatio: notatio siderum	35^{37} iuxta mathematicorum constellationem
23	Censor: dignitas iudicalis	
24	Censere: iudicare	(9^{25} censeo; 151^{2} censebant; but the inf. is not the 'dictionary form.')
25	Ciliarchus: qui mille praeest	31^{4} chiliarcho, id est tribuno militum
26	Colobium: ham	51^{23} colobium
27	Cene: grece nouum	
VI. *c.* 28	Cyatus: calix	
29	Caccabum: cetil	66^{18} caccabos
30	Cauea: domus in theatro	49^{3} cauearum (so MSS.; Giles absurdly *cauernarum*; the meaning is 'dens' in the arena).

[1] There appears to be no accepted mode of referring to this glossary. Sweet's numeration in *O.E.T.* omits the purely Latin glosses, and is therefore unavailable for the present purpose.

	31 Coniuentia : consensio	49^{34}	coniuentia
	32 Cuniculum : foramen uel canalis	39^{27}	cuniculum
	33 Cudat :[1] fabricat	156^{22}	cuderet
	34 Coccum bis tinctum : uuiloc- read	15^{34}	bis tincto cocco (from Exod. xxvi. 1)
	(35 and 36 are Bible glosses)		
	37 Cintia : luna	136^{24}	noctem Cynthia comit
	38 Calculus : ratio *uel* sententia uel tebelstan	44^{22}	nec calculo computari . . . ualet

Here we come to the bottom of a page, and the sequence of Aldhelm glosses is broken by 35 items mainly from other sources, though among them are a few Aldhelmian words, including the characteristic *cittis*. Then follows another Aldhelm series :

VII. *a*	36 Catapulta : sagittae	59^{23}	catapultas de falsitatis faretra prolatas
	37 Cercylus : aesc *uel* nauis	10^{27}	cercilo
b	1 Cluat : nobilitat		
	2 Chaos : duolma	34^{21}	chaos
	3 Conquilium : uuilucscel	75^{16}	rubro conquilii sanguine
	4 Cauillatio : iocus cum uicio	63^{11}	cauillatione
	5 Conopeum : rete muscarum	76^{29}	conopeo

The following 37 glosses contain nothing that is necessarily Aldhelmian, but after these we come to a short batch showing some remarkable coincidences :

VII. *c*	6 Crudiscente : inualiscente.	67^{8}	crudescente
	7 Claua : stegn	172^{29}	clauam
	8 Cient : commoueant	206^{5}	cient
	9 Cerealia : sacra cereris		
	10 Conuenio : groetu *uel* adiuro		
	11 Contis : spreotum	265^{28}	contis
	12 Ceremonias : ritus sacrificandi	35^{36}	caeremonias

The next item (Cereacas : tubicines) is an unmistakable Orosius gloss, and the following 80 glosses seem to be from other sources than Aldhelm. But then begins another series of 28 items, of which 18 are Aldhelmian :

VIII. *b*	22 C<l>austella : clustorlocae	56^{12}	clustella
	23 Cantarus : genus uassis		
	24 Cerula : haeuui	34^{19}	cerula (often in Aldhelm)
	(25-27 are not from Aldhelm)		
	28 Cataplasma : medicamentum	26^{31}	cataplasma
	29 Clatrum : pearroc	49^{4}	clatrorum
	30 Crepundium : monile gutturis	9^{4}	crepundia (common in Aldhelm)
	31 Cautionem : scriptionem		(? A Bible gloss : Luc. XVI. 6 cautionem)
	32 Cautum : scriptum	31^{28}	praesertim cum de illo cautum[2] (Giles *cantum* !) sit.
	33 Cospis : palester	153^{31}	cuspide uexilli
	34 Calcar : spora	59^{25}	calcar
	35 Cauterium : mear<c>isern	26^{34}	cauterio

[1] Read *cudit* with Corpus.

[2] The word is glossed 'scriptum' in Cleop.

36 Clabatum : gybyrdid	77^{15} clauatae	
37 Chorea, *graece :* saltatio cum cantilena		
VIII. *e* (1, 2, probably not from Aldhelm)		
3 Catasta : gloed	63^{2} catastarum	
4 Celox : ceol		
5 Capsis : cest	138^{16} capsis	
6 Cenox, *uel* index : testis		
7 Colludium : turpis ludus	193^{29} saeui colludia luxus.	21^{22} colludia
8 Carcesia : summitas mali		
9 Crustu : ornatu	77^{11} crustu	
10 Ca<ta>ractis : waeterthruch	8^{33} cataractis	
11 Ceruus : elch	255^{6} ceruos	
12 Culmen : qui culmis tegitur	47^{30} culmine	

The remaining 25 items on this page contain no unequivocal traces of Aldhelm, and after this two leaves of the MS. have been lost, which contained the rest of C and the whole of D and E. So far as I can judge from the Erfurt Glossary (another copy of the same archetype), the original glossary had no more Aldhelm glosses in letter C. A comparison of the length of the Aldhelm groups in this letter with that of the intervening gaps seems to suggest that in the archetype the Aldhelm material was continuous (beginning with the first entry), and that the interruptions are due to the misplacing of two leaves, each containing about 38 or 40 glosses.[1]

It is now evident that the compiler of the archetype had before him a somewhat extensive set of *glossae collectae* on Aldhelm, similar to Cleop., though differing from it in the wording of most of the explanations. Whether the Corpus redactor used the *same* collection, gleaning after the harvest of his predecessor, or whether he used an independent collection, is not a question of great importance. I myself believe the latter view is correct; but as the arguments are subtle and might fail to be convincing, I will not here enter upon them.

Hitherto, I have not explicitly referred to any of the works of Aldhelm except the prose *De Virginitate*. But Cleop., in addition to its glosses on this treatise, contains also glosses on the metrical *De Laudibus Virginum* and the poem *De Octo Principalibus Vitiis*, and other MSS. have glosses on the *Aenigmata*. I may be content to say briefly that both the collection of glosses used by the compiler of the archetype, and that used by the Corpus redactor for his additions, drew from MSS. of all these three works. Sufficient evidence of this will be found by anyone who will take the trouble to go through the whole alphabet of the Epinal-Erfurt Glossary, and that of the Corpus additions, in the same manner as I have gone through the C section of Epinal. If anybody will take this trouble, he will be able to form an approximately correct estimate

[1] I must confess that letter C is a very unfair sample, for in every other letter the Aldhelm glosses are much less numerous, and instead of occurring in large blocks are dispersed (as if by design) among the rest. This may throw an interesting light on the methods of the compiler, but it certainly does not weaken my argument.

of the number of Aldhelm glosses in each of the two strata of the Corpus Glossary.

I will now point out a few instances in which an eccentric rendering in the Corpus Glossary becomes intelligible when we know the context in which the lemma occurs in Aldhelm.

A 495. Albo: penna. This looks mysterious enough, but Aldhelm has two passages, either of which will serve to clear it up. In 41^{23} he speaks of Cosmas and Damian as *aethralis litteraturae albo descriptos*. In 61^{25} he says that S. Eulalia *caelesti inscribitur albo*. The glossator guessed that *caelesti albo* meant 'with a heavenly pen.' The guess was wide of the mark, but it was not silly; for it perfectly fitted the context; and though in fact *album* was not the Latin for a white goosequill, there seems no reason why it might not have been. Compare Aldhelm's riddle *De Penna Scriptoria* 'Me dudum genuit candens onocrotalus albam.' The blunder was not shared either by the glossator of Digby 146 or by the one whose work was excerpted in Cleop.; they both render the word correctly, though they express the meaning differently.

C 460. Clasma: pax *uel* turba. This curious alternative is explained by reference to Aldhelm 52^{26}: 'Caeteris enim uiolati foederis clasma concorditer reconciliantibus.' Here it might seem doubtful whether *clasma* had the meaning of 'peace' or the very opposite meaning 'disturbance of the peace' (*turba*). I think there can be no reasonable doubt that the word is the Greek *κλάσμα*, though I am not aware that this has been found with the meaning 'breach.' In 197^{18} Aldhelm uses *hoc clasma tetrum* apparently for 'this horrible outrage'; and the second Erfurt Glossary renders *clasma* by 'damna.'

N 132. Nonnulli: multi iniusti. In Chapter XXV. of the *De Virginitate* Aldhelm asserts that S. Clement was the immediate successor of S. Peter, 'quanquam nonnulli Linum et An<a>cletum in pontificatus regmine nequiquam praeferant.' Some glossator, thinking that *nonnulli* did not correctly represent the facts, wrote over it *multi iniuste*, 'many persons wrongly.' It was not very usual for a glossator to try to improve his text instead of explaining it; but in this same passage MS. Digby 146 has the gloss *quam plurimi* written over *nonnulli*. Perhaps the opinion rejected by Adhelm had become more popular since the date of his writing.

R 122. Redi<ui>ua: aettaelg. The OE. gloss was in the eighth century a perfectly natural spelling for *edtelg*, a re-dyeing; a word which has not been found, but which is regularly formed, and may very well have existed. This interpretation, however, found no acceptance, because it was not known that *rediuiua* had any sense that could be supposed to have been rendered by the OE. word. But it was pointed out by Dr. Schlutter in Wölfflin's *Archiv für lat. Lexicographie*, vol. xiii., p. 288, that the Corpus gloss refers to Aldhelm 19^{30}, where virginity is compared to purple, widowhood to cloth re-dyed after wear (*rediuiua*), and wedded purity to plain wool (*lana*). How rare the word *rediuiua* was in this sense may be seen from the fact that the glossator of MS. Digby 146 had to guess at its meaning from the context. He perceived

that it must denote some kind of cloth intermediate in value between purple and plain wool, and he therefore glossed it by *linum*. The proof that R 122 is an Aldhelm gloss is not affected by the fact (pointed out by Ehwald in the *MGH.* edition) that the whole passage of Aldhelm is a quotation from an older writer. This writer, by the way, has *noua purpura* instead of *purpura*, whence it would seem that *rediuiua* is merely an adjective; and it is quite possible that in this specific sense it was never used in any other instance. Professor Toller, in the supplement to the A.S. Dictionary, actually perceived that the normalized spelling of *aettaelg* would be *edtelg*, and quoted the Aldhelm passage; but having unfortunately not seen Schlutter's note, he derived *edtelg* from *telga*, a branch, and rendered it by 'what springs up again without sowing.'

I will now refer to certain serious chronological difficulties, which have rendered some scholars unwilling to admit the possibility of the existence of Aldhelm glosses in the Corpus Glossary, or at any rate in its earliest stratum. It is, I believe, the unanimous verdict of palaeographers that the Corpus MS. cannot be dated later than the middle of the eighth century. But the Corpus Glossary is unquestionably a remodelled and enlarged edition of the earlier work which has been preserved in the Epinal and the First Erfurt Glossary. Now although the Epinal and Erfurt MSS. are later than the Corpus MS., the forms in which the OE. words occur in them are very much more archaic than the forms in the Corpus Glossary; in fact, very often they are precisely the forms which, if these two MSS. had not been preserved, our philologists would have been compelled to give with an asterisk as the inferred forms in prehistoric Old English. At least a generation or two, one would say, must be allowed for the developments in the phonology and spelling of the language between the date of the archetype of Epinal and Erfurt and the date of the Corpus MS. Yet there is no doubt that Aldhelm died in A.D. 709. In view of these facts, it is not surprising that some philologists have thought that the existence of Aldhelm glosses in the archetype of Epinal and Erfurt was antecedently impossible. The argument, however plausible, of course becomes valueless if the positive evidence I have offered is trustworthy. But the question remains whether we are bound to bring down the accepted date of the Corpus MS., or whether the verdict of the palaeographers can in any way be reconciled with the results of the investigations of the present article. I believe it can be so reconciled, on the assumption—unsupported indeed, but also uncontradicted, by any evidence—that the archetype of Epinal and Erfurt was compiled in the school of Aldhelm at Malmesbury, and perhaps under his personal superintendence. Aldhelm was above all things a schoolmaster; his writings owed their immense popularity far less to the desire for spiritual edification than to their supposed value as a storehouse of exquisite Latinity; indeed, I strongly suspect that the author (though he may not have confessed as much even to himself) was really of the same mind as his readers. It seems not unlikely that he may have caused several of his pupils to make transcripts of his works as soon as they were written, and have encouraged them to gloss their copies, as a useful part

of their course of study. Indeed, he may sometimes even have helped them with the interpretation of difficult words: the general correctness of the Aldhelm renderings in Epinal, as compared with the frequent blundering of later glossators, seems to suggest that the information may have been derived from the fountain head.

It will be obvious that in any future investigation of the sources of the individual Corpus glosses the Aldhelmian element will have to be taken carefully into account. Every instance of coincidence between a Corpus lemma and a word occurring in Aldhelm's text must be registered, and its value determined in accordance with the special circumstances of the case. If the lemma is in an inflexional form, which must have come from some glossed text, and if it is found with the required meaning in Aldhelm, and not in any other of the texts known to have furnished material to the glossarist, then—subject only to the fallibility of all human inferences—we may safely conclude that Aldhelm was the source. If, again, the lemma appears in a well-marked Aldhelm batch either in Epinal-Erfurt or in the additions in Corpus, the conclusion will be equally certain. If, on the other hand, we find it in a batch (e.g.) of unquestionable Virgil, Orosius, or Bible glosses, then we must refer it to the source thus indicated. There are, however, not a few instances in which at first sight two different sources appear equally probable. Take, for example, B 118 'Biothanatas: seolfbonan' (i.e. self-murderers). In Chapter XXXI. of the *De Virginitate*, Aldhelm says that unless the obligation of preserving chastity is held to override all other obligations, the man who takes his own life because the only alternative is to commit a sin against purity 'inter biothanatas reputabitur.' (The reading *biothanatas* is found in all MSS., though the editors have substituted the normal *biothanatos*.) This at first sight looks decisive. But Aldhelm borrowed the expression from Cassianus, who, speaking of a fanatic monk who in an access of religious frenzy had thrown himself into the water, and died in consequence, says that but for his known holiness of life he would have been, 'inter biothanatos reputatus,' deprived of the honours due to the faithful departed. We seem therefore to have two possible sources for this item, and the criterion of position in the glossary fails us here. But in the first place the coincidence in form is remarkable, as the apparatus of the critical edition of Cassianus shows no alternative to *biothanatos*. Very likely Aldhelm, knowing that the word was Greek, and misled by plausible Greek analogies, imagined that it ought to be of the first declension. In the second place, while we know that Aldhelm glosses were used freely by the Corpus redactor, I am not aware that he has incorporated any glosses on Cassianus. In this instance, therefore, I should decide in favour of Aldhelm. A similar question arises with regard to I 196, 'In transmigrationem: in foernisse.' Aldhelm (22^{21}) has *in transmigratione*, and as Epinal (though not Erfurt) gives the lemma with the ablative, the discrepancy in the inflexion need not greatly trouble us. But the phrase occurs also in Orosius ('plurimos Iudaeorum *in transmigrationem* egit,' III. vii. 6), and as both Epinal and Corpus have this entry in a distinct Orosius group, one

of the most striking apparent examples of the debt of the archetypal collection to Aldhelm glosses must be abandoned as fallacious. When a lemma is found, with the sense indicated by the gloss, both in Aldhelm and in Orosius, Rufinus, Virgil, or the Bible, the earlier source is the more probable, unless there is some special reason for deciding otherwise.

II.—EMENDATIONS AND INTERPRETATIONS.

1.—(*Jewel names*) I have discovered that one of the sources of the archetype of Epinal, Erfurt, and Corpus must have been a non-alphabetical glossary which contained six lines practically identical with Leiden XLI. 9-16 (see Hessels, *Leiden Glossary*), except that No. 12 (*sardius*) was omitted and (it would seem) inserted by an afterthought in the margin. These lines were intended to be read straight across the page; but the alphabetical compiler took it into his head that they were to be read in two columns. (Possibly the page had been originally meant to be in two columns, and a line ruled down the middle, which the scribe disregarded.) The result of this misunderstanding is that six of the seven glosses appear in the alphabetical glossaries either mutilated, or with irrelevant additions, or both together. The following reconstruction will show what has happpened:[1]

C 77	Calcidon ut ignis lucens.	Smaragdus uiridem colorem habet	S 378
	hoc est prasinum. Sar	donix habet calorem sanguinis,	S 82
S 466	qui est onichinus.	Crisolitus auri colorem et stellas	C 886
	luculentas habet.	Byrillus tantum[2] ut aqua resplendet	B 97
T 210	Topazion ut aurum micat.	Cyprassus[3] uiridem habet colorem,	C 977
	ut est porrus,	et stellas aureas habet.	

These lines, read straight across, coincide, except for slight differences of spelling, with what we find in the Leiden Glossary. Read in two columns, they yield the nonsensical explanations that occur in the three alphabetical glossaries. The first syllabus of *Sardonix* was corrupted into *Ser;* the scribe of the Erfurt MS. (doubtless following his predecessor) wrote the letter *p* underneath, for what reason I am unable to guess. Hence in Epinal and Corpus we have the unmeaning entry 'Sper, qui est onichinus, luculentas habet.' The compiler of the alphabetical glossary, without correcting this blunder, added the correct but incomplete reading 'Sardonix habet colorem sanguinis,' and also (from the margin, as I have suggested above) the entry Leiden No. 12, 'Sardius, colorem purum sanguinis.' The list is taken from Apoc. xxii., and follows the Bible order; but it is odd that the first two items, *iaspis* and *sapphirus* were omitted in the copy used by the alphabetical compiler, though preserved in Leiden, and the two last, *hyacinthus* and *amethystus*, are missing in all four glossaries.

2.—(A 172) Accintu: denetle. *Accintu* is certainly a scribal error for *acantum*, and *denetle* is the OE. *netle* (nettle, accusative), with some mutilated

[1] The numbers attached to the half-lines are those of the corresponding entries in the Corpus Glossary (ed. Hessels).

[2] So Epinal; Corpus omits the word; Leiden according to Hessels, has a contraction for *tamen*.

[3] For *Chrysoprasus*.

word prefixed. Compare the Old High German and Old Low German glosses in Diefenbach: 'Acantum nesselsame' (nettle-seed); 'Acantum, netele, netelsat' (nettle, nettle-seed). The notion that *acanthus* meant some kind of nettle (the seed of which was used in pharmacy) appears elsewhere; e.g. in the following glosses:

'Acantum est semen urticae; multum est laxatiuum' (*Sinonoma Barth.* ed. Mowat, p. 9).

'Achalaphe, ygia, acanturie uel acantum, urtica pungens, idem' (*Alphita*, ed. Mowat, p. 1).

'Acanthis aegyptiaca, semen urticae' (*Glosses of P. de Abano* in Appendix to *Alphita*, ed. Mowat).

What the prefixed syllable in *denetle* can be is doubtful. There is an English word *dea-nettle*, recorded from the sixteenth century onwards, which Murray (see O.E.D., s.v.) thinks cannot be identified etymologically with the synonymous 'dead nettle.' (It is applied locally to several distinct plants.) It is barely possible that it may have come down from the OE. period, and that our gloss is an example of it. Much more likely, however, is the supposition that some letters have been lost before *-de*. *Reade netle*, 'red nettle,' is a plant name that occurs several times in OE. writings. But it seems to me more probable that we should read *<sticien>de netle*, the exact equivalent of *urtica pungens* in the gloss quoted above from *Alphita*.

3.—(A 483) Alites: challes. Read 'Aliter: alio, elles.' The letters *ali* could easily be misread as *ch*, and *oe*, in the English hand of the eighth century, closely resembles *a*. The OE. *elles* glosses *aliter* in the Digby MS. of Aldhelm.

4.—Amineae: sine rubore. A pseudo-etymological interpretation, taken from Servius ad Verg. *Geo.* II. 97: 'Amineum uinum dictum est, quasi sine minio, id est rubore, nam album est' (Virgil, *Ammineae uites*).

5.—(A 536) Amilarius: mearh (=horse). Read 'admissarius.'

6.—B 55) Baruina: barriggae. B 196 Braugina: barice. I suspect that these lemmata are corruptions of *bargina*, which is twice used by Aldhelm (180[14] and 194[23], though Giles, following earlier editors, substitutes *pagina*, which makes no sense; in the former place Cleop. glosses it *ða eldeodigan*, 'the foreigners'). What the word really meant is not easy to discover from the examples in the *Thesaurus*, but a gloss there quoted calls it *βαρβαρικὴ προσφώνησις*. Aldhelm apparently had got hold of some descendants of the gloss, for he apparently uses the word for the adverb *barbarice*. A gloss 'barbarice' seems to have lost its first syllable (perhaps because it coincided with the first syllable of the lemma), thus yielding the 'barice' of B 196. A scribe supposed *barice* to be an English noun with the feminine agent-suffix, and normalized the spelling to *barriggae*, as in B 55.

7.—(B 165) Bouestra: radre. It is with great hesitation that I give what will be deemed (perhaps rightly) a too adventurous explanation of this obscure item. The OE. gloss can hardly be anything but *radore*, 'in the firmament.' Now in Cleop. (WW. 523[29]) we find a gloss 'Vetre: radores,' where *uetre*

stands for *aethrae* in Aldhelm's text (164^{11}). A possible Latin expression for 'in the firmament' would be *globo astrorum* (cf. *globus astrorum*, Aldh. 277^{22}). I suggest that the compiler of the Corpus Glossary found the gloss *radore* written over *(glo)bo astrorum;* that he read the lemma as *bouestrorum;* and that in his glossary he changed the supposed genitive of a *plurale tantum* into the nominative, retaining the OE. gloss as it stood.

8.—(C 256) Caluiale: cosobricases. I propose to read: 'Callicul<a>e: colobii icones.' If the reader will write out the words in the script of the facsimile of the Corpus MS., only using the upright ſ instead of the wriggled s, he will see that there is no palaeographical difficulty in the emendation. *Callicula* occurs in Aldhelm 77^{15}: 'calliculae [*v.l.* galliculae] rubricatis pellibus ambiuntur.' In Ælfric's Glossary the word is rendered by *rocc*, which means simply 'frock' or 'tunic'; but an ancient gloss quoted in Du Cange explains it by *signum uestis*. Apparently *signum* denotes some sort of pictorial ornament on a garment, and from Du Cange s.v. *Colobium* it appears that the robe called 'colobium' was sometimes adorned with 'signa.' It seems to me certain that the unmeaning 'cosobricases' must represent *colobii* followed by some word, probably synonymous with *signa;* whether I am right in conjecturing *icones* may be doubted.

9.—(C 295) Cereacas: recessus. The lemma is evidently Virgil's *cerea castra* (*Aen.* XII. 589) which Aldhelm echoes in 4^{2}. Perhaps the Virgilian context accounts better than Aldhelm's for the gloss 'recessus.' The MS. in which the gloss was first written presumably had *castra* divided at the end of a line; the glossator seems to have taken *cereacas* for a complete word, and guessed its meaning from the context.

10.—(D 294) Digitalium musculorum: fingirdoccana. On the ground of this gloss, the A.S. Dictionaries have an entry '*Finger-doccán*, pl., finger-muscles.' But *docce* is unknown in the sense of 'muscle'; it means 'dock' (the plant). *Finger-doccan* would be a very likely name for the foxglove; and I suspect the glossator took *digitalium* for a substantive with this meaning, and ignored *musculorum*. The botanical name *Digitalis* for the foxglove is modern, and suggested by the German name *Fingerhut*. But *digitale*, 'thimble,' is so obvious a designation for the plant that we may reasonably take this gloss as sufficient evidence for its existence in the Latin of the seventh century.

11.—(E 106) Eliscium, greciae. Read 'Elis: ciũ [i.e. *ciuitas*] Graeciae.'

12.—(I 77) Indruticans: wraestende. The lemma occurs in Aldhelm 17^{37}, where Giles, against all the MSS., substitutes *infruticans*, which makes no sense. The word, of which this seems to be the only known example, means 'flaunting,' 'playing the fop,' and is correctly rendered here by *wráestende* (*wráestan*, to affect bravery or splendour, from the adj. *wrást*, *wráest*, gallant, exquisite, fine; the senses of the adj. given in Sweet's Dictionary do not agree with the examples). Cleop. has the same gloss; but the later glossators did not know the word, and guess at random. The word is derived from the Romanic stem *drūt-*, *drūd-*, gallant, brave, handsome, beloved, etc.; cf. Old French *dru*,

It. *drudo*, etc. The normal form of *indruticare* in O.F. would be *endrugier;* I do not find this, but Godefroy has *drugier* (<*drūticāre*). See Schlutter in Wölfflin's *Archiv f. lat. Lexicographie*, xiii. 287; he refers to the Old Irish *drúth*, but this according to the Celtists is a loan-word from Romanic. The Romanic stem is probably of Germanic origin.

13.—(I 270) Inedia: stupore dentium. Hessels, whose diplomatic edition of the Corpus Glossary is a marvel of accuracy, and who rarely transgresses into textual criticism, has for once made a bad blunder in suggesting the word-division *stupor edentium*. For *stupor dentium* is a medical term, occurring a score of times in the Latin translation of Galen, as the rendering of *αἰμωδία*. ('a scorbutic affection of the gums,' L. and Sc.). It also occurs in the Vulgate (Amos iv. 6) for the 'setting on edge' of the teeth, so often mentioned in Hebrew prophecy. Here the LXX has *γομφιασμὸν ὀδόντων*; but in the book of Jeremiah the verb corresponding to this meaning is *αἰμωδιᾶν* (Vulgate *obstupescere*). An English writer of 1607 has 'stupidity of the teeth'!

But *stupor dentium*, whether in the technical or the popular sense, does not seem a very appropriate rendering for *inedia*. There is something here that requires explanation. A convincing solution of the puzzle was given to me in conversation by Prof. J. A. Smith, who pointed out that *inedia* must have been a scribe's conjectural emendation for *emodia*, the natural late Latin transliteration for *αἰμωδία*. The scribe deserves some credit for his cleverness in hitting upon a common Latin word so much like the unintelligible *emodia* in shape, and having a meaning that had something to do with his teeth. Perhaps the source of this gloss may be found in some Bible commentator who quoted the Greek word.

14.—(L 93) Ladascapiae: briensis, id est hondwyrm. As *hondwyrm* ('hand-worm') means the itch insect, it seems natural to guess that *-scapiae* is some sort of corruption of *scabies*. Perhaps *latā scabie* may have occurred in some prose passage alluding to Verg. *Geo.* III. 299 ('glacies ne frigida laedat molle pecus, *scabiem*que *ferat*') and have been mistaken for a plural noun. Confusion of name between the disease of sheep and that of human beings would, I suppose, be natural enough.

15.—(M 40) Melito: meditor, meadrobordan. *Melito* is obviously *μελετῶ*. Hessels marks *meadrobordan* with an asterisk as an OE. gloss, but it is really a separate entry, 'M<a>ea<n>dro: bordan' (i.e. 'with a border'). This is clearly a Virgil gloss; see *Aen.* V. 251.

16.—(M 183) Melfoben; musa. mane mea e greco. Shall we read *manu mea*, and take the words as a remark of the scribe: 'Added by my hand from the Greek'? If this is the explanation, the scribe had little cause for boasting in his rendering of *Melpomene*. The Erfurt Glossary has 'Melboren: musa.'

17.—(P 188) Partica: reodnaesc. The lemma has been supposed to be a mistake for *pertica*, whence *reodnaesc* is (with a query) rendered 'perch' in the first edition of Clark Hall's A.S. Dictionary. But *partica* is for *Parthica*, Parthian or Persian leather, and *reodnaesc* means 'red leather.' This was partly

explained by Napier (in note to OE. Glosses, I. 5324), who, however, wrongly followed Schlutter in the suggestion that *-naesc* is a mistake for *-laesc*. *Laesc* and *naesc* both are well authenticated words denoting a kind of leather, and are etymologically distinct.

18.—(R 215) Rotnum: nabogar. The gloss means 'an auger.' Sweet and Hessels print *rotnum*, but Wright-Wülcker *rotrum;* the letters *r* and *n* are hard to distinguish in this MS. I think the scribe must have intended to write *rotrum*, as the word seems to be a truncation of *taratrum*, a common mediaeval Latin word for 'auger.'

19.—(S 283) Serion: inepte. Erfurt has 'inepte uel discrete.' Perhaps this is correct, and the original lemma was *loco serione*.

20.—(S 173) Scara: scaed. In Bosworth-Toller's A.S. Dictionary s.v. *sceabb* (=modern Eng. *scab*), the lemma is explained by reference to Du Cange. '*Scara*, crusta uulneris,' and *scaed* is treated as a scribal error for *scaeb*. This is plausible, but wrong. For the Erfurt Glossary has 'Scara: arborum tensitas' (for *densitas*), and the Epinal Glossary 'Sacra: orborum (*sic*) densitas.' Hence it is evident that *scaed* is correct, and means 'shade.' I have little doubt that the Epinal reading *sacra* is the right one, and that here (as often happened) the gloss has been attached to the wrong word in the text, which is probably Verg. *Geo.* III. 334, 'sacrā . . . umbrā.'

21.—(S 379) Smus: wellyrgae. I have no doubt that this is a misreading (as old as the compilation of the archetypal glossary) for *Erinis* (=Erinnys): *walcyrgae* (=*Valkyrie*). The same gloss, with another spelling of the lemma, appears in E 351, 'Eurynis: walcyrge.' In the script of the Corpus MS. *Erinis* and *Simus* (the reading of the Erfurt MS.) are very much alike; both consist of six minims followed by *s* and preceded in the case by *s*, and in the other by *E;* and *S* and *E* are sufficiently alike for the one to be misread for the other when carelessly written.

22.—(S 641) Sualdam: durhere. Of course the lemma is for *ualuam* (often written *ualbam*). The prefixed *s* may be due to some such context as 'taciturnitatis *ualbam* reserando,' Aldhelm's grandiloquent phrase (42[1]) for giving speech to the dumb.

23.—(S 701) Suae der butan toðum. This is an OE. gloss (='like a toothless beast') that has lost its lemma.

24.—(T 311) Tractibus: naescum. Read *raescum*, and compare 'imbribus (ignium): raescum' in Napier OE. Glosses. From the gloss it would appear that the lemma is taken from some passage alluding to or imitating Verg. *Geo.* I. 367, 'Flammarum longos a tergo albescere tractus.'

25.—(V 208) Viscellum: broht. The OE. gloss is a misspelling for *broth*, with the same meaning as in modern English; and the lemma is a mistake for *iuscellum*, a well-authenticated word.

26.—(V 222) Vistula: suge sweard. Although a very different suggestion has been made by a scholar who has done valuable work in the interpretation of glosses, I think there can be no reasonable doubt that the OE. words mean

a sow's 'sward' or skin. If so, *uistula* cannot be for *fistula* in any known sense. Can it be a blundered rendering of (*s*) *uis cuticula?* Or does it represent a Vulgar Latin **ustula*, from *ustulare* to singe (a swine)?

The corruptions in the Corpus Glossary are innumerable. I have endeavoured in this article to confine myself strictly to those of which the correction is not extremely obvious and has not already been proposed. It is only too likely that I may have sometimes overlooked a published conjecture identical with or preferable to one of my own. If so, I can only express my regret, and plead in excuse that I have had no time to search through the many learned periodicals in which articles on the subject may be found.

HENRY BRADLEY.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since the above was in type, and too late for any extensive corrections to be made, I have become convinced by evidence kindly furnished to me by Professor W. M. Lindsay of the unsoundness of the argument on which I principally relied as proving that the archetypal glossary (as distinguished from the additions made by the redactor of Corpus) contained a large number of Aldhelm glosses. I still see reasons for believing, though with diminished confidence, that a few such glosses do exist in Epinal-Erfurt. My proof that there is a large Aldhelmian element in the latest stratum of the glossary remains unaffected. I wish now to reinforce it by citing the following additional example of a Corpus gloss, otherwise unaccountable, which can be convincingly explained by a reference to its source in Aldhelm's text:—

U 162. Viriuola: maritalis complexus. The plausible guess that *uiriuola* is a feminine adjective from *uir* and *uolo* is erroneous. The source is clearly Aldhelm 21^{36}: 'angulari duorum testamentorum lapide de collis cacumine sine uiri uola hoc est maritali complexu absciso.' Aldhelm regarded 'the stone cut from the mountain without hands' of Dan. ii. 34 as an allegory of Christ. For the *sine manibus* of the Vulgate he substituted *sine uola* as being less commonplace Latin, and inserted *uiri* in the interest of the allegory.

H. B.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

Atene e Roma. XXI. July, Aug., Sep., 1918.

Luigi Pernier, *Luigi Savigioni and his Work.* Luigi Pareti, *Portus Lunae.* Adduces ancient and medieval testimony in great detail to prove that the harbour was situated at the mouth of the Macra, not in the Gulf of Spezia. Changes in the coast-line have obliterated its traces. R. Melani, *In Alpibus, huiusce Tempore Belli.* A Latin poem. Obituary notice: Friedrich Hauser (C. Albizzati).

Athenaeum (Pavia). VI. 3. 1918.

R. Schiava attacks the hypothesis that the heroes of the adventurer-class (e.g. Herakles, Perseus, Jason) are to be traced back to divinities. He accepts the animistic origin of many heroes of other types; others he thinks are to be explained by local worship of dead warriors, often protectors of their cities. This latter class he thinks may have been confused with obscure local deities. After briefly reviewing the early theories of C. O. Müller, Max Müller, and others of later date, he arrives at the point of view taken by Dr. Jane Harrison in *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* With certain exceptions he would attribute heroic legends to the work of creative imagination, and holds that the god-myths reflect not so much natural phenomena as human social conditions and mentality. In conclusion he pleads for more elasticity in interpreting and classifying manifestations and searching out origins.

C. Pascal supports Inzerillo as to the double meaning of *emendare*, (1) a wider one of 'adding to,' or 'annotating,' and (2) a narrower one of producing or publishing a new, or republishing an old work. In the sense of 'correcting' its use is exceptional (as in the 'emending' by Valerius Cato of the verses of Lucilius [Hor. *Sat.* X.], and in a passage in Pliny's *Letters* V. 12, 2). Pliny more often uses *corrigere* in this sense, when some critic has perhaps played the part of Dr. Verrall's 'splendid emendax.' For its use in the sense of restoring an original text he quotes the work on the codices of Livy's first decade. The work on books 3, 4, 5 was taken up by a new scribe, Nicomachus Dexter, who had a second codex before him, so that over that period the clerical errors of the Veronese codex escaped correction. In the strict sense of 'publishing,' *emendare* is used in the passage from St. Hieronymus on the poems of Lucretius, 'quos postea Cicero emendauit.'

VI. 4. 1918.

The editor discusses Horace, *Epistles* I. 4, connecting it with the 33rd Ode of Book I., and ridicules the frequent interpretations given to it, which find Horace in the character of a cynical man of the world, consoling a lŏve-lorn poet who is nursing his grievances in a lonely forest, composing elegies in competition with a poetaster, and who is to be consoled by paying a visit to a sleek follower of Epicurus! P. finds in the little poem mainly irony addressed to Tibullus, who had candidly criticized his Satires and was ostensibly a Stoic, but one who had all the advantages of Epicurean prosperity. And this austere friend will come and call him, Horace, the little pig in the sty of Epicurus. The Albius addressed here and in *Ode* 33 is identified with Tibullus.

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1918.

Oct. 5. F. Fügner, *Des Titus Livius* Römische Geschichte seit Gründung der Stadt. Im Auszuge hrsg. von F. F. (R. Berndt). In his notice of some volumes of this school book the reviewer gives a full account of the *Hilfsheft* (dritte verbesserte Auflage, bearb. von A. Rosenberg, pp. 140), which will be useful to all students of Livy. R. has a thorough knowledge of recent work on the subject and has rewritten much of the book, including the introduction to the first Decade, the chapters on Livy's sources, and on the historical importance of the Second Punic War.

Oct. 12. J. Sitzler, *Ein ästhetischer Kommentar zu Homers* Odyssee. Dritte verb. Aufl. (Ziehen). The changes in the new edition are not very important. W. Bannier contributes to this number a paper *Zu griechischen Inschriften.*

Oct. 19. J. Steinthal, *De interpolationibus Plautinis* (Klotz). The reviewer discusses the value of the linguistic tests which, with the help of the *Thesaurus*, the author applies to suspected passages. *Publications of Princeton University.* Archaeological expedition to Syria. Division II.: *Ancient Architecture in Syria*, by H. C. Butler. Division III.: *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria*, by E. Littmann and D. Magie (Hiller v. Gaertringen). The reviewer sketches the contents. E. Herdi, *Die Herstellung und Verwertung von Käse im griechisch-römischen Altertum* (Keller). Elaborate and thorough. A. Klamp contributes to this number a paper on the text of Tacitus, *Dialogus*, 6, 9 sqq. He proposes to read *quam quae diu serantur* for *quamquam alia diu serantur.*

Oct. 26. R. Herkenrath, *Die Handlung in Sophokles'* Philoktet *und ihr Bühnengott Herakles* (Bucherer). Deepens our understanding of the play. G. A. Harrer, Consules suffecti *in the years* 98 *to* 101 (Liebenam). The reviewer gives a summary of the literature on the subject. E. M. Pridik, *Inventar-Katalog der Stempel auf Henkeln und Hälsen von Amphoren und auf Ziegeln.* Eremitagesammlung. With illustrations (F. Hiller v. Gaertringen). This book, which is written in Russian, is highly praised. A. Kurfess contributes a paper on the text of Cic. *De Imp. Pomp.* § 18, § 24, and § 57.

Nov. 2. G. Körte, *Göttinger Bronzen.* With illustrations (Pagenstecher). Of some value for tracing the influence of Etruria on Rome. W. Soltau contributes an article on the Scriptores Historiae Augustae.

Nov. 9. V. Gardthausen, *Die griechischen Handzeichen* (Weinberger). Supplements Gardthausen's *Griech. Pal.*

Nov. 16. M. Schuster, *Zur Deutung des Arriusepigramms* (Helm). The point of the epigram (Catullus 84) is that Arrius tries to speak in an old-fashioned way, but does it badly. A. Engelbrecht, *Zur Sprache des Hilarius Pictaviensis und seiner Zeitgenossen* (Tolkiehn). The writer has a thorough knowledge of patristic literature. E. Müller-Graupa contributes to this and the two following numbers an interesting study of certain uses of the Infinitive, especially in German and Latin, entitled *Der Infinitivus 'Primitivus.'* The main point of the paper is well expressed in the words of Wagner (*Quaest. Verg.* IV. 642): 'Antiquis temporibus verbo nondum per tempora modosque digesto solo utebantur infinitivo; quae ratio loquendi ut est balbutientis infantiae, ita hodieque invenitur apud populos quosdam rudes et barbaros; retenta interdum illa quidem etiam a cultioribus populis.'

Nov. 23. Th. Langenmaier, *Lexikon zur alten Geographie des südöstlichen Äquatorialafrika* (Philipp). Based on the writer's dissertation 'Alte Kenntnis und Kartographie der zentralafrikanischen Seenregion.' IX. *Bericht der Römisch-germanischen Kommission*, 1916 (Anthes).

Classical Weekly (New York). 1918.

Nov. 18. Cagnat and Chapot, *Manuel d'Archéologie Romaine.* Tome Premier (D. M. Robinson). 'There is no good handbook covering the whole field of Roman

archaeology as this publication will cover it.' Percy Gardner, *A History of Ancient Coinage* 700-300 B.C. (D. M. Robinson). 'One of the most important books which have appeared in recent years in the field of classical archaeology.'

Dec. 2. In this and two following numbers C. K. reviews briefly some recent additions to the Loeb Library.

Dec. 16. R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama* (D. M. Robinson). 'One of the most scholarly books in recent years on a classical subject. . . . It is neither literary nor strictly archaeological, but rather deals with dramatic technique and with the technical background and environment of the Greek drama.'

1919. Jan. 6. C. K. contributes to this and the next number a paper on *Irrigation among the Greeks and the Romans.* He points out that books of reference give little or no help on the subject. 'It seems worth while, therefore, to group passages I have found in ordinary reading in which reference is made by Greek or Latin writers to irrigation, and to combine with these a few additional passages, from *Columella* and the *Digest*, supplied by Pauly-Wissowa.'

Jan. 20. *Faustus Andrelinus and Joannes Arnolletus, The* Eclogues *of*, ed. with Introduction and Notes by W. P. Mustard (D. P. Lockwood). 'He gives us a compact and documented biography of each author, a sound text, and an exhaustive citation of literary parallels, particularly passages borrowed from the ancient authors.' J. F. D'Alton, *Horace and his Age, a study in historical background* (W. B. McDaniel). 'This work meets the needs of the ordinary reader of Horace better than any other single volume known to the reviewer.'

Rassegna Italiana. I. 1. 1918.

N. Festa, in a treatise on the publication of Thucydides' *History*, discusses the discrepancies among the notes of the scholiasts referring to the divisions into books, as well as the variations of numbers and letters used for numeration. Wilamowitz, Conradt, and Hude, viewing the question from another point of view, were concerned with indications in the Cod. Vat. F. discusses the internal evidence of the *History* itself. Diodorus speaks of nine books, and it is suggested that the earlier and more frequent division into eight may have been changed in order to bring the number up to that of the volumes of Herodotus, which would have been beside it in collections. But the question of greater importance is: How did the author himself divide his material? Marcellinus and the scholiasts speak of thirteen books. The formula used as signature occurs twelve times (the Introduction not being 'signed'). Each book contained one year of the war, except β and θ, which cover two years each, and F. supposes the author published them 'seriatim' as he wrote them. For convenience, and to equalise approximately the length of the books, they were successively regrouped into eight and nine volumes. His explanation of some of the apparent contradictions is that Thucydides, as he published the sections, received criticisms and suggestions which made him revise and expand certain passages in previous books (e.g. contrast the expulsion of the Peisistratids in VI. 54-59 with I. 20, 21; also cf. the justification of his chronological methods in V. 20 with II. 1).

I. 2. 1918.

G. Pasquali maintains that the *Characters* of Theophrastus were not written for the general public, being, according to classical standards, unfinished in form. The frequent occurrence of the hiatus, the lack of elegance in structure and the tiresome repetition of formulae have led to the supposition that they were to be used in rhetorical courses, that they were a collection of material for comic actors, or that they were 'illustrations' to be used in connexion with the author's systematic ethical instruction, or incorporated in a large work. P.'s suggestion is that, like his master Aristotle, Theophrastus was wont to use lecture-notes, left in the rough, but

elaborated here and there, *βιβλία ἀνέκδοτα* to be withheld from circulation as long as they were useful in attracting the more lucrative pupil. His reputation for wit would attract a larger audience who would find amusement, while the more serious student of ethics would find teaching. This P. thinks may account for the apparent repetition of similar characters—versions perhaps revised and remodelled to fit them for use in various lectures on ethical subjects. (*To be continued.*)

Revue de Philologie. XLII. 2. 1918.

L. Havet, Proprius, *Terme rituel.* In Plaut. *Capt.* 862 and elsewhere it means that the victim has been fed up to the very moment of sacrifice, and is in prime condition and fit to be offered to the gods. F. Cumont, *Ecrits Hermétiques : II. Le médecin Thessalus et les plantes astrales d'Hermès Trismégiste.* M. Badolle, *La date d'avènement de Ptolémée IV. Philopator.* The evidence of the papyri shows that Philopator probably came to the throne in September, 221. G. Mathieu, *Isocrate et Thucydide.* Reviews: *Washington University Studies* V. ed. F. W. Shipley. Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. These abstracts are carried to the end of 1917.

Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica. XLVI. 4. Oct., 1918.

Luigi Pareti, *More about the* Taurini *in the Time of Hannibal.* Recapitulates and defends against the strictures of De Sanctis his contention that Hannibal entered Italy by the Little St. Bernard [see *C.Q.* VI. (1912), p. 212]. Livy (XXI. 38. 6 sqq.) was misled through not knowing the wider significance of *Taurini*, which included the Salassi and the Lepontii. The capital of these Taurini (*Taurasia* in Appian), which Hannibal attacked, was not on the site of Turin or in its neighbourhood. The article discusses also the etymology of *Taurini* and of *Poeninus.* Remigio Sabbadini, *The Vergilian Codex* F. This illustrated MS. (No. 3225 in the Vatican Library) now contains only 75 leaves out of an original 420 or so, but it is more free from interpolations than any other codex of Vergil. The script belongs to the fourth or the fifth century. Many peculiarities of spelling indicate a Spanish origin. Umberto Moricca, *The Tragedies of Seneca* (another instalment; to be continued). Claims for Seneca a large measure of originality in the construction and development of his plots and in character-drawing. The thesis is supported by a detailed comparison with the Greek models, and is further illustrated by means of modern literature, e.g. Racine's *Andromaque.* Seneca's characters have more variety than those of Greek tragedy, and in the new touches which he introduces he shows a profound and sympathetic knowledge of the human heart. Reviews: G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani,* Vol. III. (U. Pedroli). The work of De Sanctis need not fear comparison with its rivals in other countries. It is thoroughly up to date, and shows great sanity and penetration in its criticism of authorities. The author is to be congratulated on having refrained from all reference to the Great War. It would have been all too easy to bring together what seem to be striking parallelisms between the past and the present—'easy indeed, but misleading, and, above all, ill befitting the seriousness of scientific work.' Louise E. Matthaei, *Studies in Greek Tragedy* (G. Fraccaroli). This book 'penetrates into the heart and substance of the texts.' It is full of fine analysis and suggestive criticism, and is a delight to read. It does more than 'many sacks of tiresome erudition' to make Aeschylus and Euripides known to us. If there is anything to which one may take exception it is that in her criticism of Euripides the author seems occasionally, like Euripides himself, to over-emphasize the rational, as opposed to the emotional, element. [The editor mentions, with a regret which will be fully shared by English and American scholars, that the learned writer of this review has lost his life in a street accident. An obituary notice will appear in the next number.]

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY—OCTOBER, 1919.

ENNIVS AND THE PUNIC WARS.

SINCE the days of Merula it has been regularly assumed by editors and critics of Ennius that, despite the express statement of Cicero to the contrary, the *Annales* did contain some narrative of the events of the *first* Punic War. Familiar as the passage in the *Brutus* is, it must be quoted once again: "Tamen illius quem uatibus et Faunis annumerat Ennius Bellum Punicum quasi Myronis opus delectat. Sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior: qui, si illum, ut simulat, contemneret, *non omnia bella persequens, primum illud Punicum, acerrimum bellum, reliquisset.*"

Is there any valid reason for refusing to accept this statement, strong and explicit as it is, at its face value? It is inconceivable that Cicero would have made it, knowing it to be untrue. To his generation the *Annales* was no remote or unfamiliar poem: on the contrary, it was immensely popular—was, in fact, one of the best known works in the whole range of Latin literature. Any statement made concerning it could be immediately and authoritatively tested, for almost contemporary texts were extant until a date much later than Cicero's. Materials for correction or confutation were, therefore, easy of access; yet no suggestion of contradiction has reached us from ancient sources. We cannot in common honesty brush Cicero's evidence contemptuously aside as do Lucian Mueller[1] and Vahlen,[2] we cannot distort it by a misinterpretation with Skutsch[3] or a mistranslation with Valmaggi,[4] we cannot leave it altogether undiscussed with Lenchantin de Gubernatis.[5] Until we have definite proof of its falsity, we must believe that it is true. And that proof we most certainly have not. Probabilities are, indeed, all the other way. In the case of single lines and detached fragments, it is almost impossible to attain to anything like certainty: but an unprejudiced examination of the fragments themselves will show that we are absolutely unjustified in supposing that any one of them necessarily formed part of a narrative of the first Punic

[1] *Q. Ennius, Eine Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*, p. 168.
[2] *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, p. clxxix.
[3] In Pauly-Wissowa, *s.u. Ennius* (col. 2607).
[4] *Q. Ennio, I. Frammenti degli Annali*, p. 61.
[5] *Ennio, Saggio Critico.*

War. One of those generally included in this supposititious narrative must, it is true, have some connexion with that war: one other refers to the *second* Punic War. But of the others it may be said that they apply to certain events in the war with Pyrrhus with at least as great appropriateness as to anything in the first Punic War.

I would suggest, then, that the war with Pyrrhus was treated on a scale so elaborate that it occupied part of the seventh book (where the first Punic War is generally placed) as well as the whole of the sixth. The earlier portion of the war, introduced by the famous exordium and by some notice of the antecedents of Pyrrhus, was the subject of Book VI. It is noteworthy that none of our fragments need refer to anything later than the battle of Asculum. Book VII. contained the Sicilian episode and the conclusion of the war, and opened with the *Primordia Carthaginis*. Such a digression at such a point would be even more in place than as a prelude to the first Punic War, as it was during Pyrrhus' operations in Sicily that the train was laid. Ennius had the strongest of motives, both personal and artistic, for dwelling on the war with Pyrrhus while altogether omitting the longer and more important first Punic War. Nor need there be any difficulty in supposing that the narrative of a single war was carried on into a second book. The second Punic War is universally allowed two whole books; and in any case the divisions appear somewhat arbitrary, and are arguably not the work of Ennius himself, but of the grammarian Varguntеius.

It remains to examine the fragments themselves:[1]

1. Appius indixit Karthaginiensibus bellum.

Quoted (without exact reference or author's name) by Cicero. *Referred* to the outbreak of war.

2. Mulserat huc nauem conpulsam fluctibus pontus.

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Priscian.

3. Et melior nauis quam quae stlataria portat.

Quoted (without exact reference) by scholiast (*ad Iuu.* VII. 134). *Referred* (with [2]) to the wrecked Carthaginian galley.

4. . . . tonsas ante tenentes
Parerent, obseruarent, portisculus signum
Cum dare coepisset.

Quoted (from Book VIII.) by Nonius.

5. Poste recumbite, uestraque pectora pellite tonsis.
6. Pone petunt; exim referunt ad pectora tonsas.

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Festus. *Referred* (with [4]) to the preliminary drill of the Roman sailors (260 B.C.).

[1] I give, following the text and arrangement of Vahlen, those which are referred to the first Punic War by Mueller and Valmaggi as well as by Vahlen himself.

7. Denique ui magna quadrupes eques atque elephanti
Proiciunt sese. . . .

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Gellius and others. *Referred* to the defeat of Regulus by the Carthaginians under Xanthippus.

8. Alter nare cupit; alter pugnare paratust.

Quoted (from Book VII.) by Festus. *Referred* to the sea power of Carthage and land power of Rome (Mueller), or to the battle of Ecnomus (Valmaggi), or left uncertain (Vahlen).

The first of these fragments plainly refers to the outbreak of the first Punic War. But need it be anything more than a 'time note,' a means of dating some other event (with *postquam* at the end of the line before)? Or possibly it may belong to the *scripsere alii rem* passage. On this assumption it would be, in effect, a parody of Naevius, perhaps an hexameter version of one of his own Saturnians, introduced as a specimen of the narrative style that Ennius affected to despise. The gist of the passage would be 'others have told the tale—and this is how they did it.' The line would find an appropriate place at the *end* of the *Primordia Carthaginis*, to account for the omission of the most momentous event in Carthaginian history, the natural climax of the résumé already given.

Fragments 2 and 3 I would place together, as describing the effects of the storm that overtook Pyrrhus on his voyage to Italy and the excellence of his own ship which enabled him to weather it for a time: cf. Plutarch, *Life of Pyrrhus*, Ch. XV.: *καὶ μέσον ἔχων τὸν Ἰόνιον, ἁρπάζεται βορέᾳ ἀνέμῳ πάρ' ὥραν ἐκραγέντι. καὶ βιασθεὶς αὐτὸς μὲν ἀρετῇ καὶ προθυμίᾳ ναυτῶν καὶ κυβερνητῶν ἐξανέφερε καὶ προσανῆγε τῇ γῇ πολυπόνως καὶ παραβόλως, τοῦ δὲ ἄλλου στόλου συγχυθέντος καὶ τῶν νεῶν σκεδασθεισῶν, αἱ μὲν ἀποσφαλεῖσαι τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐξεώσθησαν εἰς τὸ Λιβυκὸν καὶ Σικελικὸν πέλαγος, τὰς δὲ ὑπερβαλεῖν μὴ δυνηθείσας ἄκραν Ἰαυπυγίαν νύξ τε κατελάμβανε καὶ πολλὴ καὶ χαλεπὴ θάλασσα παίουσα πρὸς χωρία δύσορμα καὶ τυφλὰ πάσας διέφθειρε πλὴν τῆς βασιλικῆς. Αὕτη δὲ πελαγίου μὲν ἔτι ὄντος τοῦ κύματος, ἠμύνετο καὶ διέφευγε μεγέθει καὶ ῥώμῃ τὰς ἐπιβολὰς τῆς θαλάσσης.*

The comparison in No. 3 would gain in point and aptness, as we could refer it to the other ships which carried the impedimenta and animals. Its meaning would be that the king's ship was the best in the whole fleet.[1]

No. 4 plainly belongs to the *second* Punic War. It is quoted from Book VIII., and nothing is gained by refusing to accept the number. The reference, no doubt, is to the 'sham fights' described by Livy: "Hunc ordinem laboris quietisque quoad Carthagine morati sunt, seruauerunt.

[1] This involves a change in the number of the book to which (2) belongs. But numerals are notoriously easy of confusion.

Remigium classicique milites tranquillo in altum euecti agilitatem nauium simulacris naualis pugnae experiebantur" (XXVI. 51).[1]

Nos. 5 and 6 have been with common consent referred to the famous drill of 260 B.C., elaborately described by Polybius. But that was not the only occasion on which sailors were drilled: nor is there any hint of the special feature of that drill—namely, that it was carried out *on land*. Ennius' language would apply equally well to drill on the water: it might conceivably refer to an actual order and its carrying out, if the crews were badly trained or unwilling. We are, then, probably concerned with the 'pressed men' of Pyrrhus, either when they were first enrolled, when they must have been drilled, or during the encounter which he had with the Carthaginian fleet on his return voyage to Italy. We know that his unwilling recruits were specifically intended for rowers:

Εὐτυχίᾳ δὲ καὶ ῥώμῃ τῶν παρόντων ἐπαιρόμενος καὶ διώκων τὰς ἐλπίδας ἐφ' αἷς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔπλευσε πρώτης δὲ Λιβύης ἐφιέμενος καὶ ναῦς ἔχων πολλὰς πληρωμάτων ἐπιδεεῖς, ἤγειρεν ἐρέτας, οὐκ ἐπιεικῶς ἐντυγχάνων ταῖς πόλεσιν, ἀλλὰ δεσποτικῶς καὶ πρὸς ὀργὴν βιαζόμενος καὶ κολάζων. . . . (*Life*, Ch. XXIII.).

If the lines refer to an actual order, it would most naturally be given at the moment when he had decided to concentrate his efforts on getting through to Italy, as he ultimately did.[2] To the same moment the last fragment (No. 8) may well belong. Its meaning has been much disputed; but it can be understood, quite simply and literally, to mean 'one side [Pyrrhus] is eager to advance upon its way, the other [Carthage] is ready for the fight.'[3]

Our one remaining fragment can be referred to a retreat, even a disorderly retreat, as well as to an advance; and the most striking event of the battle of Beneventum was the panic inspired among *τὰ θηρία* of Pyrrhus by the Roman fire:

. . . καὶ συμβαλὼν ἐκ προδήλου, τὸ μὲν ἐτρέψατο τῶν πολεμίων, ἔστι δ' ᾗ βιασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων καὶ συσταλεὶς πρὸς τὸ στρατόπεδον τοὺς φύλακας ἐκάλει συχνοὺς ἐφεστῶτας τῷ χάρακι μετὰ τῶν ὅπλων καὶ ἀκμῆτας. οἱ δὲ ἐπιφανέντες ἐκ τόπων ὀχυρῶν καὶ τὰ θηρία βάλλοντες ἠνάγκασαν ἀποστρέφεσθαι καὶ φυγῇ χωροῦντα διὰ τῶν συμμάχων ὀπίσω ταραχὴν ἀπεργάσασθαι καὶ σύγχυσιν. . . . (*Life*, Ch. XXV.).

However, whether these individual ascriptions be right or wrong, it is surely unreasonable to maintain that the *first* Punic War contains the only events to which the lines in question can refer. And once that is admitted, there is no longer the slightest justification for refusing to take the word of Cicero.

ETHEL MARY STEUART.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, CARDIFF.

[1] This possibility Vahlen admits (though the other editors do not), and quotes this and the similar passage in XXXV. 26 (referring to the war with Antiochus).

[2] *Life*, Ch. XXIV.

[3] 'Nare' meaning simply to move through or over the water.

NOTE.—War conditions made it impossible for me to see Norden's *Ennius und Vergilius* until after my own conclusions on the probable contents of Book VII. were fully formed. I rejoice to find that he too maintains, in the warmest possible language, that Cicero's statement must be believed. "Ein unzweideutigeres Zeugnis," he says, "dafür dass Ennius jenen Krieg (the first Punic War) absichtlich überging (*relinquere* bedeutet etwas absichtlich unbeachtet lassen) lässt sicht, so sollte man glauben, nicht wohl vorstellen. Der Zeuge *ist der denkbar beste*" (*op. cit.* p. 63).

He, too, makes 'Appius indixit,' etc., a mere date; and, though referring Fragments 2-6 and 8 to the drill of 260 B.C., he supposes the description of it formed part of the *Primordia Carthaginis*. His main theory seems to be that Book VII. contained the events of 235 B.C. and later.

SOME GLOSSES IN THE TEXT OF SOPHOCLES.

In attempting to determine the text of Sophocles in the places presently to be discussed, it is not my purpose to put forward a series of novelties which, though more or less plausible, are essentially incapable of proof. I seek rather to plead for the reception of certain ascertained but neglected variants, and to establish their claims by a survey of the relevant evidence. After a somewhat prolonged study of the data, I am convinced that the chief hope of progress—apart from the discovery of fresh material—lies in a more methodical use of the ancient scholia and lexicographers. Although their value has long been acknowledged, they have been employed unintelligently or at haphazard, largely because the character of their information and its sources have been imperfectly understood. One of the chief aids which they afford is in passages where the genuine reading has been displaced by an explanatory gloss. This is a possibility which critics have always recognized, but, while ready enough to suggest that the word selected for expulsion is a gloss on some other, they frequently fail to demonstrate that it is used as a gloss at all. Leaving such guess-work aside, we shall still find various grades of probability. It should be a minimum requirement that the word removed from the text is, either itself or as one of a class, a well-attested gloss of the proposed substitute. Thus in *El.* 800, where LA with most other MSS. have *καταξίως*, but four of the *recentiores* *κατ' ἀξίαν*, I think that Bothe and Monk were right in preferring *κατάξι' ἄν*. Jebb objects that the change is improbable. Surely not, when it is observed that the adverbial use of the neut. acc. plur. is regularly glossed by the form in *-ως*. So *El.* 164 *ἀκάματα*] *ἀκαμάτως*. *Ai.* 196 *ἀτάρβητα*] *ἀντὶ ἀταρβήτως*. *Ant.* 527 *φιλάδελφα*] *φιλαδέλφως*. *O.C.* 319 *φαιδρὰ δὲ ἀντὶ τοῦ φαιδρῶς*. In *Ant.* 446 it is perverse to prefer *συντόμως* to *σύντομα* merely because the former is supported by L and the latter by A, especially when Lb gives the tell-tale reading *σύντομα* with *συντόμως* superscript. But we shall have still greater confidence in the result if we can show that one of two variants recorded in the apparatus is the habitual equivalent of the other. In such a case probability comes as near to certainty as the contingent nature of the problem admits. I hope presently to bring forward some such instances, but before doing so I wish to show the injury done by glosses in cases where the evidence of their intrusion is, I think, unimpeachable.

In *O.C.* 1068 sqq. our MSS. give *πᾶσα δ' ὁρμᾶται κατ' ἀμ|πυκτήρια φάλαρα πώλων | ἄμβασις*. But Hesych. I. p. 153 has *ἀμπυκτήρια· τὰ φάλαρα. Σοφοκλῆς*

Οἰδίποδι ἐν Κολωνῷ, obviously in reference to this passage. Moreover, metre shows that 1069 is seriously corrupted, since the antistrophic line ἔνθ' οἶμαι τὸν ἐγρεμάχαν—a choriambic (polyschematist) dimeter—does not correspond with φάλαρα πώλων, while indicating that ἀμπυκτήρι(α) with the last letter lengthened or elided answers to ἔνθ' οἶμαι τόν. Hence it is generally recognized that φάλαρα πώλων must go, and that either there is a hiatus after κατά at the end of 1068 or else κατά has taken the place of an iambic word with synaphea. Jebb adopts Schneidewin's καθεῖσ' (as an easier change than Hermann's χαλῶσ') with Wecklein's ἀμπυκτήρια στομίων. But the consequent attempt to show that ἀμπυκτήρια can be interpreted 'reins' is difficult to accept; for the schol. min. on Aesch. *Theb.* 448, on which reliance is placed, states no more than that ἀμπυκτῆρες was applied to the straps which fasten the horse's bridle round his head. That is reasonable enough. Although in the passage of Aeschylus—ἵππους δ' ἐν ἀμπυκτῆρσιν ἐμβριμωμένας—as in Quint. 4. 511, to which also appeal is made, the words ἀμπυκτήρ and ἄμπυξ, as suggesting trappings in general, might loosely be equated with χαλινός, all the authorities concur in stating that the strict meaning is *frontlet* or *head-piece*. But to drop or loosen the frontlets in order to accelerate the speed is hardly a credible proceeding. The true reading is probably beyond recovery, and the passage is quoted to show how much mischief a gloss may cause. It may, however, be suggested that a tolerable meaning is obtainable with the least possible alteration by reading κατὰ | ἀμπυκτήρι' <ἀντιπάλων> to be rendered 'all the mounted men are moving against the frontlets of the foe.' For κατά then compare Xen. *Cyr.* VI. 3. 12 ἱππεῖς προελαύνουσι κατ' αὐτοὺς ἡμᾶς.

The detection of a gloss will remove a notorious crux in *O.T.* 476 φοιτᾷ γὰρ ὑπ' ἀγρίαν | ὕλαν ἀνά τ' ἄντρα καὶ | πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος. The first hand of L wrote πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος, which is corrected to πέτρας ὡς ταῦρος, the reading of A and the majority of the MSS. Lb and a few others have πετραῖος ὡς ταῦρος, two πέτραις ὡς ταῦρος (these readings deserve notice as representing the intermediate stages of the corruption). The faulty metre of the vulgate was patched up by Dorville, who supposed that ὡς was a gloss on ἅτε, with πέτρας ἅτε ταῦρος, and Martin's well-known πέτρας ἰσόταυρος was adopted by Jebb, Kennedy, and Tyrrell. I contend that the whole of the trouble was caused by the writing of ὡς above the article as an explanatory gloss to indicate the presence of a metaphor. I have given examples of this intrusion in the note on Soph. fr. 279 τραχὺς χελώνης κέρχνος ἐξανίσταται. Similar instances of λείπει τὸ ὡς will be found in the Sophoclean scholia in *Trach.* 14, 1259, and *Phil.* 727, and deserve careful attention. Now it appears from his Appendix that Jebb would have defended πετραῖος ὁ ταῦρος but for two objections. The less serious of these, that πετραῖος cannot be used as a local adverb (='among the rocks'), is removed by Soph. fr. 581. 3 (usually assigned to Aeschylus) θρασὺν πετραῖον ὄρνιν ἐν παντευχίᾳ. The second is the supposed harshness of the substitution of a metaphor for a simile. But the refusal to recognize this as a thoroughly idiomatic type is the outcome of the same tendency which

furthered the interpolation of ὡς. Cf. e.g. fr. 800 Λυδία λίθος σίδηρον τηλόθεν προσηγάγου, where Jebb consistently required the addition of ὡς. Anyone who feels a doubt as to the range of the idiom should consult the full collections of Professor P. Shorey in *Class. Phil.* IV. 433 and of Blaydes on Ar. *Lys.* 694. In the present connexion it is important to remember that it is especially frequent in allusions to beast-fables: Cratin. fr. 52 οἱ δὲ πυππάζουσι περιτρέχοντες, ὁ δ' ὄνος ὕεται. Theogn. 347 ἐγὼ δὲ κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην, | χειμαρρῳ ποταμῷ πάντ' ἀποσεισάμενος. An objection may be raised in regard to the presence of the article. The difference, I suppose, is this. When present, it marks an express reference to a known fable. Otherwise, the substance of the fable is re-stated as not necessarily familiar.

In *El.* 947 L gives ἄκουε δή νυν ἧ βεβούλευμαι ποεῖν, whereas A, supported by a considerable majority of the other MSS., has τελεῖν in place of ποεῖν. In the margin, but in a later hand, L has the variant γρ. τελεῖν. τελεῖν remained the vulgate until Dindorf substituted ποιεῖν in his edition of 1860. He has been followed by the majority of subsequent editors for no other reason that I can discover than blind deference to the authority of L. No one appears to have raised the question why one of the alternatives was substituted for the other. Yet the answer is not far to seek. ποιεῖν was a gloss introduced for the purpose of explaining that τελεῖν means 'to carry into effect.' See Hesych. IV. p. 140 τελῶμεν : ποιῶμεν, which is referred to Hom. δ 776 ἀνάσταντες τελέωμεν μῦθον ('accomplish the plan'). Phot. τελεῖ· ἐπιτελεῖ, ποιεῖ. Still more cogent is *O.C.* 13, where the διορθώτης has written πο above the first syllable of τελεῖν, but whether as gloss or variant it is impossible to say. I cannot think that anyone who considers these facts will advocate the retention of ποεῖν. But the consequences are more important than the establishment of this particular reading. If A has preserved the genuine tradition which L has lost, how can we refuse in other cases to judge its evidence upon the merits? Indeed, the question is no longer open, now that the papyri have shown that even the inferior MSS. occasionally preserve an old variant, as is the case in *O.T.* 827. We may, therefore, hesitate to conclude that such remarkable readings as προνοουμένῳ of M Ven in *O.T.* 685 and ἐν χεροῖν of M in *O.T.* 1031, both of which anticipate modern conjectures, are actually due to Byzantine interpolation.

In *O.T.* 87 sq. our MSS., supported by Stob. *flor.* 108. 54, have λέγω γὰρ καὶ τὰ δύσφορ' εἰ τύχοι | κατ' ὀρθὸν ἐξελθόντα πάντ' ἂν εὐτυχεῖν, while Suid. Zonar. vv. δύσφορα differ in offering ἐξιόντα for ἐξελθόντα, and agree with some of our scholia in explaining it by προϊόντα. I believe no one has found anything to say in favour of ἐξιόντα. Jebb, like Dindorf before him, calls it 'a mere error.' Blaydes says it is a frequent error of the copyists, which is a cryptic utterance. Facts point to another story. Hesych. II. p. 126 explains ἐξίμεναι by ἐξελθεῖν, agreeing with schol. H λ 531, and correspondingly ἴωμεν by ἔλθωμεν, ἰών by ἐλθών. Apollon. *lex. Hom.* v. ἰών drops a hint of the grammarians' purpose by his glosses πορευόμενος ἢ συντελικῶς ἐλθών. ἐπεὶ πᾶσα μετοχὴ ὀξύτονος εἰς

—ων λήγουσά ἐστιν συντελική, quoting Hom. γ 286. Actually they held that its accent showed *ἰών* to be a second aorist participle: Cramer *Anecd. Ox.* I. 211, 20. Hence, whenever the context pointed to a complete action, as in *Ant.* 742, they glossed it with *ἐλθών*, but, if the action was continuing, as in *O.T.* 324, with *ἐρχόμενος*. See also schol. rec. Aesch. *Pers.* 248 *ἰόντων* rendered as *ἀπελθόντων*, *ib.* 646 *ἰόντ' αἰνέσατε* by *αἰνέσατ' ἐλθεῖν* (schol. M: *ἐλθόντα* schol. rec.). Is there any longer a doubt as to the origin of *ἐξελθόντα*?

Ant. 223 *ἄναξ, ἐρῶ μὲν οὐχ ὅπως τάχους ὕπο | δύσπνους ἱκάνω* is quoted by Arist. *rhet.* 3. 14. 1415*b* 20 with *σπουδῆς* for *τάχους*. The editors are not of one mind; for Aristotle commands more respect than Suidas. Jebb argues that, since *τάχους* is free from objection, it should not be displaced, in view of the likelihood that Aristotle quoted from memory. We must answer that *τάχους* is suspect for the very reason that it is convertible with *σπουδῆς*. Hom. O 402 *σπεύσομαι*] *ταχυνῶ* schol. B. That this was the ordinary gloss appears from Aristonicus on Δ 232 *ἡ διπλῆ ὅτι τὸ σπεύδοντας οὐχ οἷον ταχύνοντας ἀλλ' ἐνεργοῦντας καὶ κακοπαθοῦντας*. B 99 *σπουδῇ* is interpreted by schol. BL *μόγις· δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ λέξις καὶ ταχέως*, quoting Hom. O 209 *σπουδῇ νῦν ἀνάβαινε*. Hesych. IV. p. 68 calls this the ordinary sense of *σπουδή* (*ἡ συνήθης ἡμῖν σπουδή*), quoting the same passage, which he glosses by *μετὰ τάχους*. Schol. A: *ὅτι σπουδῇ λέγει οὐχ οἷον ἐν τάχει ἀλλὰ μόγις καὶ δυσχερῶς*. That is the case in favour of Aristotle.

O.T. 276 *ὥσπερ μ' ἀραῖον ἔλαβες ὧδ' ἄναξ ἐρῶ* is quoted in part by Eustath. p. 1809, 14 with *εἶλες* in place of *ἔλαβες*. Jebb's note (after Blaydes) is misleading: 'the paraphrase of Eustath. *ὥσπερ με εἶλες διὰ τῆς ἀρᾶς* is substantially right.' But, if he had verified the reference, he must have noticed that Eustathius, before giving his paraphrase introduced by *ἤγουν*, quotes *ὥσπερ μ' ἀραῖον εἶλες* as the actual words of Sophocles. Dindorf ascribes the variant to a defect of memory; but that is not Eustathius' way.[1] It is possible of course that Eustathius or his source, finding *ἔλαβες* in the document to be reproduced, wrote down *εἶλες* owing to some casual perversity. But then it is also possible that the copyist of the archetype of our MSS., finding *ἔλαβες* written above *εἶλες*, adopted what he took to be a correction instead of adhering to the text of his exemplar.[2] Which is the more probable alternative may be inferred from the following glosses of Suidas: *εἶλεν· ἔλαβεν, αἱρήσομαι· λήψομαι, ἕλωσι· καταλάβωσι*, and of Hesychius: *αἱρήσασθαι· λαβεῖν, ἑλεῖν· λαβεῖν, ἑλών· λαβών, εἵλετο· ἔλαβεν*. In Eur. *Hipp.* 657 *ἠρέθην* was restored in place of *εὑρέθην* by the Dutch critic Pierson on the strength of the scholiast's *ἐλήφθην*. These facts lend some support to Paley's *ὁρκίοις αἱρουμένους* in Aesch. *Eum.* 486. For the reasons given I think that Eustathius was right, and that the tradition of our MSS. has been corrupted.

[1] This is not to say that there are no such loose quotations embedded in the text of Eustathius. Each case must be judged on its own merits and no such general inference as is drawn by Jebb in *Antig.* p. 250 is justifiable.

[2] *λαβεῖν ὅρκοις* is just as good Greek as *ἑλεῖν*: cf. Hdt. 3. 74. *O.C.* 284 is too doubtful to be put into the scale.

Here I must claim to digress in order to say a few words on the evidence of Eustathius in general. Much misunderstanding has arisen from treating him as an independent critic who controlled his material by the exercise of a free judgement. It should be clearly understood that the chief instruments which he employed were scissors and paste. To hold otherwise is to misconceive the character of his work, and seriously to impair the value of his testimony. His copious references to documents of the classical era do not imply that he had access to originals which we have lost. For that part of his text which is of value to us he was the unintelligent copyist of his technical authorities, the last repository of grammatical learning which had been put into circulation more than 1,000 years before his date. Ignoring this, Jebb[1] has drawn from his citation of *Antig.* 1167, which is lost in our MSS., the extraordinary inference that a class of MSS. containing the verse was still extant in the twelfth century. Equally baseless is Dindorf's suggestion, that Eustathius copied the line from Athenaeus who twice quotes it,[2] and that the *ἀκριβῆ ἀντίγραφα* to whose authority he appeals were MSS. not of Sophocles but of Athenaeus. Eustathius, it is true, often reproduces extracts from Athenaeus, but the context proves that he has not done so here. Athenaeus says nothing at all about the critical question, but his quotations form part of a series designed to show that as an advocate of hedonism Epicurus did not stand alone. Eustathius, on the other hand, contrasts the serviceable addition of a line in the correct copies of Sophocles with the interpolation by Zenodotus of Hom. N 731. The only legitimate inference is that Eustathius extracted his material from the collection of Apion and Herodorus which is established as being one of his chief sources.[3]

The recognition of Eustathius' authority is essential to the restoration of *Ai.* 966 *ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς.* No parallel has been produced to justify the supposed equivalence of *ἤ* to *μᾶλλον ἤ*; for it is idle to quote passages like *βούλομ' ἐγὼ λαὸν σόον ἔμμεναι ἢ ἀπολέσθαι*, where the idea of preference is implicit in the verb (Kuehner-Gerth II. p. 304). There is, however, good reason to believe that the grammatical tradition supported not *ἤ* but *ἦ*. Eustathius, p. 1521. 35,[4] explaining the epithet *ἀγχίθεοι* as applied to the Phaeacians in Hom. E 35, mentions the interpretation *διὰ τὸ φιλόξενον καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν ἀρετήν*, and refers to *η* 206 *ἐπεί σφισιν ἐγγύθεν εἰμέν,* | *ὥσπερ Κύκλωπές τε καὶ ἄγρια φῦλα γιγάντων.* In a note on that passage (p. 1577. 24) he explains that the resemblance of the Phaeacians to the gods in point of righteousness is parallel to the resemblance between Cyclopes and Giants *κατὰ ἀδικίαν*, just as the relation between Socrates and Plato might be compared to

[1] *Ant.* p. lii ; text edition p. xxi.

[2] 280 B ; 547 C.

[3] The reference to *Ζηνόδοτος ὁ Μαλλώτης* is decisive: see Cohn in Pauly-Wissowa VI 1464.

[4] The silence of most editors—Jebb does not mention Eustathius—led me to suppose that I was the first to notice the importance of this evidence, until I discovered the article of Schneidewin in *Philol.* IV 472. But Schneidewin does not bring out the strength of his case, and his view of the whole speech does not commend itself. Anyhow the matter well deserves restatement.

that between Anytus and Meletus. There is a likeness between opposites according to the relation of their qualities. Thus, *τόσον ἡδὺ τὸ μέλι ὅσον ἀηδὲς τὸ ἀψίνθιον*. The substances named are selected as typical of the bitter and the sweet (Menand. fr. 708 K.). A similar example, he concludes, is to be found in the line of Sophocles *ἐμοὶ πικρὸς τέθνηκεν ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς*. But the whole discussion is irrelevant if *ἤ* is read; and, as there is no critical edition of Eustathius, it is possible that *ἦ* may be found in some one or other of the copies. Anyhow, it is essential to his argument. Nor does Eustathius stand alone. Bearing in mind that *γλεῦκος* sometimes takes the place of *μέλι* as the contrary of *ἀψίνθιον* (schol. Nic. *Alex.* 298), we may fairly believe that the miserably mutilated article of Suidas (v. *γλεῦκος*), in which *Ai.* 966 is quoted without any apparent reason, once covered the same ground as Eustathius. As straws are said to show which way the wind blows, the fact that codex V of Suidas has *ὡς κείνοις* for *ἢ κείνοις* is not without significance. Since Eustathius and Suidas clearly go back to an old-inherited tradition, they are entitled to at least as much credit as the consensus of our MSS., such as it is, in favour of *ἤ*.[1] The conclusion is strengthened by the fact that the line is quoted as an undoubted example of a familiar idiom. When we remember that the vulgate contains an indefensible solecism, the reasons for preferring *ἦ*, if it yields any tolerable sense, seem to be overwhelming. But it is also intrinsically more probable in its bearing on the context. Tecmessa's speech has been mangled by critics like Nauck, not only for its supposed numerical superfluity, but also by reason of its alleged incoherence. Jebb has combated this point of view, though not, as I think, with entire success, particularly in his artificial interpretation of the words *ἢ κείνοις γλυκύς*. My submission is that the evidence of Eustathius furnishes a clue which assists the discovery of the whole train of thought. Modern sentiment should not blind us to the main intention of the speaker, which is to drive home her conviction that Ajax has baffled his enemies' expected triumph, as they will presently discover. The supreme guerdon offered by a commonplace morality, the joy of exalting over a prostrate foe (*Ai.* 79 *οὔκουν γέλως ἥδιστος εἰς ἐχθροὺς γελᾶν*; Blaydes on Ar. *Nub.* 550), is now denied to them. 'Grant that his death is no less bitter to me than sweet to them'—these are secondary issues. The main result is that Ajax is satisfied: he has obtained his heart's desire. How can they then gloat over *him* (*τοῦδ'* strongly emphatic)? The gods, not the Atridae, are the authors of his death. Notice how she recurs to her previous assertions in 950 and 952. Here arises a question as to the precise import of the elastic datives *θεοῖς* and *κείνοισιν*. What is the meaning of *οὐ κείνοις τέθνηκεν* shortly followed by *αὐτοῖς οὐκέτ' ἐστίν*? Surely, however Sophocles apprehended their syntactical relation, the first combination must express the cause, and the second the effect. So at least I infer from Eur. *Andr.* 334 *τέθνηκα τῇ σῇ θυγατρὶ καί μ' ἀπώλεσεν*. As to the last three lines, once seize the notion that emphasis is laid upon the

[1] The first hand of L may have written *ἦ*· on *O.C.* 1131 and Plat. *Phaed.* 80 B. For similar confusions see the critical apparatus

contrast of Αἴας and *ἐμοί*, and everything falls into its place. 'Odysseus may mock us, but his taunts are idle. Ajax himself is beyond their reach, and it is I for whom his passing leaves pain and lamentation.' In other words, my misery is the counterpart of their ultimate failure.

El. 686 sq. *δρόμου δ' ἰσώσας τῇ φύσει τὰ τέρματα*
νίκης ἔχων ἐξῆλθε πάντιμον γέρας.

I follow the ancient interpreters in requiring the meaning, that Orestes issued from the context with an achievement worthy of his physical aspect. The thought is almost a commonplace in Pindar: *Ol.* 8. 19 *ἦν δ' ἐσορᾶν καλός, ἔργῳ τ' οὐ κατὰ εἶδος ἐλέγχων*, 9. 94 *ὡραῖος ἐὼν καὶ καλὸς κάλλιστά τε ῥέξας*, *Nem.* 3. 19 *τὸ καλλίνικον φέρει. εἰ δ' ἐὼν καλὸς ἔρδων τ' ἐοικότα μορφᾷ κτέ.*, *Isth.* 7. 21 *φέρει γὰρ Ἰσθμοῖ νίκαν παγκρατίου· σθένει τ' ἔκπαγλος ἰδεῖν τε μορφάεις· ἄγει τ' ἀρετὰν οὐκ αἴσχιον φυᾶς.* From the closeness of the parallel it looks as if Sophocles had these or similar passages in mind. It follows that Musgrave's ingenious *τἀφέσει* should be abandoned as a false trail. On the other hand, I agree that it is well-nigh impossible to extract the desired meaning from the text, notwithstanding Kaibel's argument that *τέρματα δρόμου* is to be regarded as the equivalent of *νίκη*. Let us see if the textual data yield any assistance: *δρόμου* LA: *δρόμον* T: *δρόμῳ* Suid. v. *δρόμοις*. *ἰσῶσαι* (*ἰσώσας* E) Suid. *τέρματα*] *πράγματα* Suid. Obviously the chief problem is to discover how Suidas got his extraordinary reading *πράγματα*. It should not be put aside as a mere eccentricity; for the answer to the puzzle is supplied by Hesych. II p. 183 *ἔργματα: πράγματα*. Similarly Suid. *ἔρδειν· πράττειν. ἔρδοι· πράττοι.* Apollon. *lex. Hom. ἔρδειν· ἐπὶ τοῦ πράσσειν.* schol. Eur. *Or.* 159 *ἐργμάτων*] *πράξεων*. I hold accordingly that *ἔργματα* must once have stood in the text of Sophocles, and also that its presence is indicated by schol. L, who, after giving a paraphrase adapted to *τέρματα*, continues *ἄλλως· ὁμοίως καὶ ἴσως τεθαυμασμένος ἐν τῷ ἀγωνίσματι ὡς ἐπὶ τῇ μορφῇ ἀντὶ τοῦ ὡς θαυμαστὸς ἐπὶ τῇ μορφῇ οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ ἐφάνη, ὡς ἐπὶ τῷ εἴδει οὕτως καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἔργῳ.* It should be added that G. Wolff conjectured *τότ' ἔργματα* for *τὰ τέρματα*. That will hardly do, and I should prefer *δρόμον . . . τά τ' ἔργματα*, which would form a hendiadys similar to *Ai.* 814 *τάχος γὰρ ἔργου καὶ ποδῶν ἅμ' ἕψεται* and to *O.C.* 1297 *οὔτ' εἰς ἔλεγχον χειρὸς οὔτ' ἔργου μολών.*

Ant. 368 *νόμους παρείρων χθονός.*

παρείρων is by general admission a *vox nihili*, and Reiske's *γεραίρων* may fairly be said to hold the field. This is well enough, although it is more naturally adapted to a personal object. But I cannot call it 'a certain correction,' as Jebb does, seeing that it fails to account for the gloss *πληρῶν* which is found in A and Lb as well as in L (*ὁ πληρῶν τὸν νόμον καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην*: cf. St. Paul *Rom.* 13. 10 *πλήρωμα νόμου ἡ ἀγάπη*). This rather suggests an original with the sense 'fulfilling' or 'carrying out'—a requirement

which is satisfied by Pflugk's *περαίνων*, as may be seen from schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 588 *περαίνει· ἤτοι πληροῖ* and Hesych. III p. 308 *περαίνει· ἐπὶ πέρας ἄγει. πληροῖ. ἀνύει.* The employment of *περαίνων* in this sense needs no justification, and palaeographically it is as easy as *γεραίρων*.

Ant. 966 *παρὰ δὲ κυανέων πελάγεων πετρῶν διδύμας ἁλός.*

The antistrophe shows that there are two syllables in excess and *πετρῶν* was promptly ejected as a gloss. Turnebus, who preferred to get rid of *πελάγεων*, has had few followers. Since, however, 'Cyanean *seas*' will never do, Wieseler in 1857 proposed to substitute *σπιλάδων* for *πελάγεων*, into which, according to Dindorf, it was corrupted. *σπιλάδων* is an attractive conjecture, and the word is applied to the Symplegades in Apoll. Rh. 2. 550 *στεινωπὸν . . . τρηχείῃς σπιλάδεσσιν ἐεργμένον ἀμφοτέρωθεν.* But it is not very probable that it was misread as *πελάγεων*, and I wonder that those who discovered a gloss in *πετρῶν* have not seen that the intrusive element was rather *πελαγίων* (*πελαγείων*) *πετρῶν*. The likelihood of this may be inferred from schol. Hom. *γ* 298 *σπιλάδεσσι δὲ ταῖς παραλίαις πέτραις . . . ἢ ταῖς κατὰ θάλασσαν περιειλημμέναις ἐν ὀλίγῳ ὕδατι.* Hesych. IV. p. 66 *σπιλάδες· αἱ περιεχόμεναι τῇ θαλάσσῃ πέτραι.* Eustath. p. 1468. 28 *αἱ παράλιαι πέτραι.* Suid., Phot., Apollon. *lex. Hom.* *Ἡλιόδωρος* (qu. *Ἡρόδωρος*) *δὲ τὰς παραθαλασσίας πέτρας.* There remains the insuperable difficulty of *παρά* c. gen. which suggests a modification of Wieseler's conjecture to *κυανέαιν σπιλάδοιν*.

Having so far confined myself to cases where a certain measure of demonstration is possible, I will end by contributing a pure guess towards the restoration of *Ant.* 1246 sqq. *ἐλπίσιν δὲ βόσκομαι | ἄχη τέκνου κλύουσαν ἐς πόλιν γόους | οὐκ ἀξιώσειν.* The oddness of the Greek is sufficiently indicated by the straits to which editors are reduced in searching for an explanation. Seidler, Erfurdt, Wunder and Dindorf supply *στένειν* from what follows, Schaefer and apparently Ellendt *προτιθέναι*. Others more boldly talk of an ellipse: Campbell, in a very vague note, of *ποιεῖν*, Dorville of *πέμπειν*, and Schneidewin-Nauck of *γοᾶσθαι*. (Observe that the idiom of Ar. *Ran.* 1279 *ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν ἐς τὸ βαλανεῖον βούλομαι*, which Dorville compares, is entirely different, if only by the absence of anything corresponding to *γόους*.) Jebb takes an independent line, construing *οὐκ ἀξιώσειν γόους* 'will not think lamentations proper'; but it is not clear how he deals with *ἐς πόλιν*. If I were forced to choose one of these, my vote would be given to Schaefer;[1] but rather than be content with the text as it stands, I should incline towards Blaydes's *ἐξανήσειν*. But we can get much closer to the MSS., and obtain exactly the sense required, by reading *ἐξισώσειν*—a word which Sophocles uses alone of the three tragedians, and with a certain boldness of elaboration. I need not stay to illustrate the ordinary uses of *ἐξισοῦν τί τινι* (where *τινί* is neut.) or *ἐξισοῦν τινά τινι* (where *τινί* is masc.); but for *ἐξισοῦν τί τινι* (where *τινί* is masc. or fem.) cf. *El.* 1194 *μητρὶ δ' οὐδὲν ἐξισοῖ* 'she has nothing in common with a

[1] No support can be drawn from Thuc. I. 134 which is itself suspect.

mother,' and the schol. *οὐκ ἴσα πράσσει τῷ τῆς μητρὸς ὀνόματι.* In *O.T.* 425 read with Wilamowitz *ὅσ' ἐξισώσεις σοί τε καὶ τοῖς σοῖς τέκνοις*, 'share between yourself and your children'. Thuc. 6. 87 (*τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*) *ἐξισώσαντες τοῖς ἄλλοις*, 'sharing the security which the others enjoy,' as explained by Mr. Marchant. But most instructive of all is *O.T.* 1507 *μηδ' ἐξισώσῃς τάσδε τοῖς ἐμοῖς κακοῖς*, which is the counterpart of the present passage. We might have found with the same meaning *ταῖσδε τἀμὰ κακά*, but the form chosen by Sophocles is in that place ever so much more effective. For *ἐς πόλιν* where the dative (*πόλει*, i.e. *πολίταις*) is normal cf. *Ai.* 680 *ἔς τε τὸν φίλον τοσαῦθ' ὑπουργῶν*, *Phil.* 1145 *κοινὰν ἤνυσεν ἐς φίλους ἀρωγάν.* The form is chosen here to convey the idea of extension='to spread over,' as in *El.* 642 *σπείρῃ ματαίαν βάξιν ἐς πᾶσαν πολιν.*

A. C. Pearson.

THUCYDIDES ON THE THIRD OF AUGUST, 431 B.C.

THUCYDIDES, II. 28, records an eclipse of the sun in the summer of the first year of the Peloponnesian war. It can be no other than the annular eclipse of the 3rd of August, 431 B.C. He describes the phenomenon so accurately and with so many details that we can hardly doubt that he observed it himself—Τοῦ δ' αὐτοῦ θέρους νουμηνίᾳ κατὰ σελήνην, ὥσπερ καὶ μόνον δοκεῖ εἶναι γίγνεσθαι δυνατόν, ὁ ἥλιος ἐξέλιπε μετὰ μεσημβρίαν καὶ πάλιν ἀνεπληρώθη, γενόμενος μηνοειδὴς καὶ ἀστέρων τινῶν ἐκφανέντων.

Ginzel, *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen- und Mondfinsternisse*, pp. 24-25, 58, 176-177, and Karte V., gives full particulars of the eclipse. The central zone passed diagonally across the Black Sea from Odessa to Trebizond. The greatest phase attained at Athens almost exactly 10 digits (10·03) at about 5.22 p.m. true time. Every particular agrees with Thucydides' description except the degree of obscuration of the sun's disk. Ten digits are not enough to bring out stars. Eleven are the minimum required (Ginzel, p. 16).

Ginzel (pp. 176-177) quotes two or three recent astronomers who have arrived at a bigger obscuration for Athens. Apart from Stockwell, who had his own peculiar theory of the moon's motion, Hofmann gives the biggest, 10·72 digits. But Hofmann also rejected the stars as a fabulous embellishment. Ginzel believes that the greatest phase at Athens might be screwed up to 11 digits, but not, it would seem, without some pressure on his astronomical conscience.

Sooner than compromise the sincerity of Urania or impute meretricious arts to Clio, let us first scrutinize the historical record. Thucydides does not explicitly define the station whence he observed the eclipse. To assume that he was at Athens is arbitrary. The tone and colour of his narrative of the early summer down to the departure of the Peloponnesian army from Attica certainly suggest that he was there. In the funeral oration put into the mouth of Pericles at the beginning of the winter we may catch the echoes of a personal impression. But between these two points lie three months, during which Thucydides chronicles the operations in Greece in the dry external manner of a distant spectator. (The note about Brasidas in chapter 25 is another story, a touch added on later information and prompted by interest afterwards aroused.) If Athens will not suit Thucydides' account of the eclipse, it is perfectly open to us, and only fair to him, to let his description determine his position, and place him where it will be most accurate.

This method leads us steadily towards the north and north-east, and it is precisely in that direction that we have the best reason to look for Thucydides, if he was away from Athens at that period. His associations with Thrace are attested by himself and are too familiar to need recapitulation. The eclipse of the 3rd of August, 431, would be appreciably greater in Thrace than at Athens. If Thucydides on that day was even no farther north and east than Mount Pangaeum, he would probably, I think, have seen the stars.

But Thucydides himself almost invites us to go a step farther. The next chapter, his very next words, recount how the Athenians made overtures to Nymphodorus of Abdera, appointed him their *proxenos*, and fetched him to Athens, wishing to win through him the alliance of Sitalces, son of Teres, king of the Odrysae, who had married his sister. Nymphodorus was not at Abdera, but at the court of Sitalces, or at all events must have gone thither before sailing; for on his arrival at Athens he concludes the alliance and accepts Athenian citizenship for Sadocus, the king's son. The Athenian envoys would naturally have sought him there, or accompanied him. Thucydides' narrative implies that an understanding with Sitalces was already reached in Thrace.

That Thucydides, connected with a princely family of Thrace and influential *ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τῶν ἠπειρωτῶν*, should have been employed on the mission, is an obvious suggestion, which is supported by his intimate knowledge of, and evident interest in, Sitalces and his family and his realm (II. 29, 67, 95-101, IV. 101). In this particular passage alone in its context can one detect the personal accent of Thucydides through the mask of the annalist, not only in his alacrity to put his fellow countrymen right, out of his own special information, on the confusion between Teres and Tereus, which was probably used to recommend to them the alliance with Teres' son, but also in his triumphant satisfaction at the success of the mission, which enlisted in the forces of Athens, in spite of their estrangement and mutual rivalry, the two most powerful kings of the north, Sitalces and Perdiccas—*οὕτω Σιτάλκης τε ὁ Τήρεω Θρᾳκῶν βασιλεὺς ξύμμαχος ἐγένετο Ἀθηναίοις καὶ Περδίκκας ὁ Ἀλεξάνδρου Μακεδόνων βασιλεύς*.

The Odrysian capital is unknown, but is to be placed in the neighbourhood of Adrianople. There at any rate Thucydides would certainly have seen the stars on the afternoon of the 3rd of August, 431 B.C.

J. A. R. MUNRO.

NOTES ON THE GREEK RHETORS.

In the course of reading some of these writers I have made the following notes. Some of the suggestions have very probably been anticipated, and in such cases I can only plead the legal maxim, *superflua non nocent*. The references are to volume and page of Spengel's edition (Lipsiae, 1853-6), and Anon. l. 427 has been cited as Cornutus.

1. οἱ μὲν οὖν πολιτικοὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς χρῶνται ταῖς ἀναλήψεσι καὶ τῇ παλιλλογίᾳ. Tiberius, 3. 71.

As these words occur in a section dealing with ἐπανάληψις I think we should read ἐπαναλήψεσι.

2. καὶ τὸ Ἡσιόδειον

μηδ' ἀπὸ χυτροπόδων ἀνεπιρρέκτων ἀφελόντα

ἔσθειν. Trypho, 3. 194.

Göttling in his edition of Hesiod (1831) wished to transpose ἀνεπιρρέκτων with ἀνεπιξέστων supr. l. 744, and took the prohibition to mean 'quod in culina feceris (*i.e.* in domus tuae penetralibus) noli aliis cinere prodere.' See his note. As against this we have ὡς μὴ κορῶναι κρώζοιεν ἐν ἀνεπιξέστῳ τῷ δώματι, Eumath. V. 16, and the above citation by Trypho, who adds, τούτεστι, μὴ ἀκρατῆ μηδὲ λίχνον εἶναι. This supports the view of Melanchthon and Erasmus, quoted by Göttling, 'ex ollis non sacrificatis ne capias cibum, i.e., ne edas priusquam dixeris precationem.' M. 'ne ritu pecudum ad cibum capiendum irruamus, sed ita demum edamus, si prius inde primitias dis immolauerimus.' E. Men should wait until grace has been said, and, *exemplum duorum iuniorum Crachittorum secuti*, not 'shriek for goose before their turn comes to be helped.'

3. ἐξ ὧν ἡ φροντὶς εἰσαγείρεται, Longinus, l. 315. 'ἐγείρεται Bakius.' Perhaps ἐξεγείρεται.

4. ἐνέργειά ἐστι φράσις ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγουσα τὸ νοούμενον . . . ἔχονται δὲ τῆς ἐνεργείας καὶ αἱ τοῦ Ὁμήρου παραβολαί. Trypho, 3. 199. It would seem an obvious correction to write ἐνάργ—and in view of ἔστι δὲ ἐνάργεια λόγος ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον. Cornutus, l. 439, I think it should be made. Cf. Longinus, l. 264; Demetr. Phal. 3. 307. But on the other hand we have δεῖ . . . στοχάζεσθαι . . . ἐνεργείας. Arist. l. 139 (*Rhet.* 3. 10), and though several MSS. read ἐναργείας, yet no such correction is possible ib. 141. λέγω δὴ πρὸ ὀμμάτων ταῦτα ποιεῖν ὅσα ἐνεργοῦντα σημαίνει. οἷον . . . οὐ σημαίνει ἐνέργειαν. κ.τ.λ. Still, as I said, I think Trypho wrote ἐνάργεια.

5. *τοῦτο δὲ τὸ μέρος αὐξήσεις τῷ μεγέθει τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἐπεργαζόμενος.* Menander, 3. 442. I should prefer *ἐπεξεργαζόμενος*. Cf. *ἐπεξεργάζεσθαί τινα τῶν παρέργων εἶναι δοκούντων.* Theon, 2. 83.

6. *ὁ γοῦν Ἔφορος ἐν τῷ περὶ λέξεως δι' αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀπαγορεύοντος λόγου, μὴ τῇ εὐρύθμῳ χρῆσθαι διαλέκτῳ, εὐθὺς ἐν ἀρχῇ στίχον εἴρηκεν.* Theon, 2. 71.

It can, I fancy, have only been by an oversight that the editor did not write *ἐνρύθμῳ*, seeing that he has corrected with Finckhius the *εὔρυθμον* of the MSS. in *τὴν ἔμμετρον καὶ ἔνρυθμον λέξιν*, ib. *supr.*

7. *εὐτελισμὸς . . . τὸ πρᾶγμα σμικρυνῶ καὶ εὐτελήσω.* Phoebammon, 3. 54. We should write *εὐτελίσω*. Cf. *ἑαυτὸν εὐτελίζοντος*, Anon. 3. 141. And *κατηυτέλισε* for *ὑμᾶς δὲ κατηυτέλησε*. Anon. 3. 149. Cf. *πράξεις . . . κατευτελίζοντος.* Plut. 2. 1097C.

8. *τὸ δὲ κεῖσθαι σχῆμα μὲν δηλοῖ . . . δευρὶ τὴν χεῖρα, ἀλλ' οὐ δευρὶ μετήνεγκεν, οὕτως ἥσθητο, οὕτως ἐνεώρα μοι.* Longinus, l. 300. '*ἥσθητο* libri *ἧστο* Bakius.' As I cannot believe that Longinus wrote *ἥσθητο*, and the context favours the notion of sitting rather than of dress, I should prefer *ἧστο*.

9. *καλιὰν τὸν πίθηκον.* Cocondrius, 3. 233.

Either the scribe or the printer has dropped a letter. Write *καλλιὰν*.

10. *ὀνοματοποιιὰ ἐστὶ λέξις ἢ μέρος λόγου πεποιημένον κατὰ μίμησιν τῶν ἀποτελουμένων ἤχων, ὡς καταχλευασμὸς ἡ ζέοντος λέβητος ἠχώ.* Anon. 3. 210.

It is clear that *καταχλευασμὸς* is not the word wanted here, and, I think, equally clear what the right word is. *καχλάζω* is of fairly frequent occurrence, and L. Sc. cite *καχλασμὸς* from Manass. Chron. 229. They also give *κάχλασμα*, Hesych., where I have failed to find it, but Stephanus quotes it from Eustath. Il. *ψ.*, where it is glossed as *βράσμα, ζέσις*. The scribe was thinking of the familiar *χλευασμός*, with which the writer deals a little later, and so wrote as above when he should have written *κατακαχλασμός*.

11. In the same passage, as another instance of onomatopoea, is given *κότταβος ἀσπίδων*. Members of Dublin University may be inclined to support this by quoting *πολὺς δὲ κοττάβων ἀραγμὸς | Κυπρίδος προσῳδὸν | ἀχεῖ μέλος ἐν δόμοισιν*, but *χωρὶς ἡ τιμὴ θεῶν*, and the *κόναβος ἐν πύλαις χαλκοδέτων σακέων* of Aeschylus (*S.C.T.* 160) suggests the true reading, which is supported by *πεποιημένα δὲ οἷον κέλαδος, κόναβος, κελαρύζειν, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.* Theon, 2. 81. We have already had some evidence that at this point the mind of the scribe went wandering, and it is a pleasing fancy that just here it reverted to the festival of the previous night, a festival unmarred by 'Dora' or Lord D'Abernon. It might even be suggested that his present aberrations were not wholly unconnected with—but perhaps, ''Twere to consider too curiously, to consider so.'

12. *ὁ μὲν (φονεὺς) εἰς ἕνα παρατυχόντα μιαιφονεῖ.* Aphthonius, 2. 34.

This can hardly be right, and as he has just below *τοῦ πάντας μιαιφονεῖν*, I would either omit *εἰς* or write *εἷς*.

13. *τοῦ Διὸς βοηθοῦντος τοῖς Τρωσὶ καὶ ἧττον μνηστευομένου τοῖς Ἕλλησιν.* Anon. 3. 119.

The key to this curious saying is to be found in the *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus, who writes as follows:

> *Δηριάδῃ δ' εὔδοντι κατηφέος ὑψόθεν εὐνῆς*
> *Βάκχῳ πιστὰ φέρουσα παρίστατο θοῦρις Ἀθήνη,*
> *γνωτῷ δ' ἐσσομένην ἑτέρην μνηστεύετο νίκην·* 26. 1.

The old Latin translation gives *spondebat*, but Bacchus was not present to be promised anything, and I take the meaning to be 'sought to procure victory for,' as in fact she does by urging on the luckless Deriades to fight by a wholly unjustified assertion of his invulnerability. This is also the meaning, though Koechly doubted it, of the later passage (37. 608), where the defeated pancratiast, in imminent peril of suffocation,

> *νίκην ἀντιπάλου μνηστεύεται ἔμφρονι σιγῇ,*
> *ἀνέρα νικήσαντα κατηφεί χειρὶ πατάξας,*

With these passages to guide us we can, by the alteration of a single letter, set the text right, *καὶ ἦτταν κ.τ.λ.*

14. *οὐ θήσεις δὲ ἐξάπαντος τὰ ἰαμβεῖα διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὰ συνήθη τοῖς πολλοῖς καὶ γνώριμα, ἀλλὰ παραδώσεις μᾶλλον.* Menander, 3. 413.

Spengel notes '*παραδώσεις* P(aris 1874): *παρῳδήσεις* ceteri.' The reading of P does not appear to afford any satisfactory sense, and the notion of parody is quite alien to the context. Now in Hesychius we find *παροδούμενον: παροιμιαζόμενον*, and, just below, *παροιμία: βιωφελὴς λόγος παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν λεγόμενος*. From this it is possible to infer a verb *παροδέω = to mention by the way*, or, *obiter*, which will give exactly the sense required here.

15. *διηγήσεις* are divided into *ἀληθεῖς*, i.e. *αἱ ἐπὶ τῶν κριτῶν λεγόμεναι*, and *πεπλασμέναι*, i.e. *αἱ καθ' ἑαυτὰς λεγόμεναι*, which latter subdivide into *βιωτικαί, ἱστορικαί, μυθικοί, περιπετικαί*. Cornutus, l. 435.

The last word may be *περιπατητικαί*, but is more probably *περιπατικαί*, a form found in Cebes, 13.

16. *δεῖ . . . μήτε περιόδοις μακραῖς χρῆσθαι . . . ἀλλὰ περιστέλλειν καὶ μὴ περιουσιάζειν.* Cornutus, l. 459.

περιστέλλειν does not give the meaning required, and I suggest that it came by an easy error from *περιουσιάζειν*, the true reading being *συστέλλειν*.

17. Again just below we find *ὥσπερ καὶ Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου· τὴν γὰρ δευτέραν περιφορὰν ἀπεριγράφως ἐξέτεινε διὰ τὸ πλειόνων κατασκευῶν δεῖσθαι.* No satisfactory sense can be extracted from *περιφορὰν*, which comes from the same error as *περιστέλλειν* above. It may be noted that the combination *περι-*, excluding the two corrected instances, occurs five times in this section of eighteen lines. I had thought of *καταφορὰν* as *ταῖς καταφοραῖς* occurs earlier in the passage, but I now think that *ἐπιφορὰν* given in the Addenda is right, as *ἐπιφορὰς* occurs just before.

18. *τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτον μέρος* (of the subject) *ἀδύνατον περιστοιχεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ἄπειρον.* Menander, 3. 348.

This may be right, though the word seems otherwise unknown, but he probably wrote *περιστοιχίζεσθαι*.

19. *ἡ δὲ περίφρασις . . . πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ περιπεφραγμένα.* Alexander, 3. 32. An obvious error of the scribe or printer.

20. *προσυναπάντησίς ἐστιν, ὅταν δύο ἐξενεγκὼν ὀνόματα πρὸς τὸ τελευταῖον πρότερον τὴν ὑπάντησιν ποιήσηται, ὡς καὶ τὸ Ὁμηρικόν,*

ἔνθ ἅμα οἰμωγή τε καὶ εὐχωλὴ πέλεν ἀνδρῶν
ὀλλύντων τε καὶ ὀλλυμένων.

τὸ γὰρ ὀλλύντων τὸ εὐχόμενον προσαποδέδοται. Alexander, 3. 40.

He uses this verb quite correctly in two earlier passages. *αἰτιαλογία δέ ἐστιν, ὅταν προθέντες τι πρὸς τὸ γενέσθαι σαφέστερον αὐτὸ τὴν αἰτίαν προσαποδιδῶμεν.* 3. 17. *ἐπάνοδος δέ ἐστιν, ὅταν δύο ὀνόματα διάφορα προτιθέντες μήπω τοῦ νοῦ πέρας ἔχοντος, ἐπανίωμεν ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα καὶ τὸ λεῖπον τῷ νῷ προσαποδιδῶμεν.* 3. 30. But here the meaning is that *ὀλλύντων* which belongs to the second word *εὐχωλὴ* has been brought in before *ὀλλυμένων*, which belongs to the first word *οἰμωγή*. We should therefore read *προαποδέδοται*. The error probably arose from taking the first syllable of the opening word of the sentence to be *προσ-* instead of *προ-*.

21. *προσαπόδοσις.* 'A Rhet. figure by which a word *is repeated in the second member* of a sentence, v. Cic. *Orat.* 3. 52, Quint. 9. 3.' 94. So L. Sc. s.v.

This is supported by Phoebammon, who writes *ὁμώνυμον . . . τῇ ἐπιμονῇ ἢ προσεπανάδοσις* (an obvious error, due to *τῇ ἐπαναδόσει* in the previous line), 3. 55, and adds, *καὶ ἡ προσαπόδοσις τοιαύτη, ἧς παράδειγμα. τίς ὁ λύσας τὸν χρησμόν; Θεμιστοκλῆς· τίς ὁ βασιλέα καταναυμαχήσας; Θεμιστοκλῆς.* 3. 56. So, too, reading prosapodosis, Mart. Cap. 5. 175. 'Pr. redditio orationis, id est, cum nomen in postrema parte membri, aut eadem quaecumque pars orationis redditur, ex qua idem membrum coepit: ut si dicas: Publicas tibi calamitates imputare debet respublica.'

The reference to Cic. I have failed to find, but in Quint., as the context shows, the word is the substantive of *προσαποδίδωμι* as used by Alexander, 3. 17, *supr.*: 'Vtrum, quod Rutilius *αἰτιολογίαν* uocat? . . . *Προσαπόδοσιν* dicit, quae ut maxime seruetur, sane in pluribus propositis: quia aut singulis statim ratio subiciatur; ut est apud C. Antonium, *Sed neque accusatorem eum metuo, qui sum innocens: neque competitorem uereor, qui sum Antonius: neque consulem spero, qui est Cicero.*' *cet.*

The only other instance I have noted is where *παρεμβολή* is distinguished from *ὑπερβατόν*. *τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὑπερβατὸν ἐν τῇ ἀλλαγῇ τῶν μορίων καὶ τῇ προσαποδόσει τοῦ ἀκολουθοῦντος σχήματος· ἡ δὲ παρεμβολὴ ἰδίαν ἔχει διάνοιαν·* Alexander, 3. 39. Here the sense seems to require *προαποδόσει*.

22. *τὸν ἐν προλήψει τιμῆς περιπεσόντα κακοῖς.* Choeroboscus, 3. 255. A comparison of this passage with *τὸν ἐν προσλήψει μείζονος τιμῆς κακοῖς περιπεσόντα*, Anon. 3. 214, shows that here too we should read *προσ-*.

23. We are told, *δεῖ τοίνυν συνεστραμμένον εἶναι τὸ προοίμιον, καὶ σπερματ-*

ικῶς ἔχειν τὰ πράγματα, καὶ ἀπηλλάχθαι πάσης ἀγωνιστικῆς ἐπιχειρήσεως. Cornutus, l. 433, and that its φράσις should be σπερματικῶς ἔχουσά τινα τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς διηγήσεως, whereas that τῶν πίστεων should be ἐναγώνιος τε καὶ πικρὰ καὶ περιόδοις καὶ κώλοις ἀνυομένη. ib. 458. But we are also told, τὴν δὲ τῶν πίστεων ἑρμηνείαν οὔτε ἀφελῆ εἶναι δεῖ, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ διηγήσει, οὔτε ἀνηπλωμένην καὶ σπερματικῶς ἔχουσαν τὰ πράγματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεστραμμένην, καὶ οἷον εἰπεῖν κωνοειδῆ, καὶ τὸ σύνολον ἀγωνιστικήν. ib. 452. This seems clearly inconsistent, and I would suggest that the words have got out of their proper order, and that after ἀνηπλωμένην they should run ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεστραμμένην, καὶ σπερματικῶς ἔχουσαν τὰ πράγματα κ.τ.λ. The meaning I take to be in all cases that the facts are briefly alluded to here and there and not set out at full length. And so in σπερματικῶς πάλιν τὰς ὑποθήκας ἐκθήσομαι. Clem. Al. 308. Cf. ἡ σπερματικὴ τῶν κεφαλαίων ἐπαγωγή. (*sparsim inserta capita*) Ulp. Dem. 9. 6.

24. οἷον ἡ ὄρνις καὶ τὰ ὑποζύγια ἰσχυραί ἢ στεραιαί. Anon. 3. 172.

The writer may have used this form, but it is simpler to write στερεαί.

25. ἔλλειψις . . . τὸ κατὰ μέσον συγκοπή, οἷον μονόνυχας μώνυχας. Zonaeus, 3. 166, which enables us to correct, κατὰ μέσον, οἷον μονώνυχας μώνυχας. Trypho, 3. 198.

26. μείωσις δὲ ὅταν σμικρύνων τι λέγῃς, ὡς Ἀριστοφάνης, οἷον τριηρίτη, βοϊδάριον, κυναρίδιον. Cornutus, l. 440. 'πυαρίτη Kayser ex Ar. *Vesp.* 710. κυνιδάριον idem.'

The latter correction may stand, but to the former there are two good objections. In the first place, the word in Ar. *l.c.* according to Dindorf (1876), Blaydes (1886, 1893), Graves (1894), and the Oxford text (1900), is not πυαρίτῃ but πυριάτῃ; and in the second place neither one nor the other is a diminutive. The original word must have been a diminutive of τριήρης, e.g. τριηρίδιον, and the copyist wrote the more familiar one in a momentary lapse *aut mentis aut calami*, οἷά τε πολλὰ . . . πέλονται with such persons, as the present writer has good reason to know. (*Exempli gratia*, on re-reading my original draft I found that I had written πεπλαγμέναι for πεπλασμέναι. Cf. 19 *supr.*)

HERBERT W. GREENE.

MVLIER ARIES, AND OTHER *CRUCES* IN CATVLLVS.

THIS instalment of suggestions is put forward with all the diffidence one is bound to feel after an examination of the great body of the manuscripts. No great writer's text has hung upon a more slender thread of evidence. Larger matters than verbal emendation are touched upon in the discussion of poem LXVIII. My theory of how our texts became dislocated (and more than half of the extant manuscripts present an order quite different from that of GOR), and some new light I hope to throw upon the form and meaning of the Peleus and Thetis, must be withheld until a later occasion.

XXV. 4:

idemque, Thalle, turbida *rapacior* procella,
cum diua † mulier aries † ostendit oscitantes,
remitte pallium mihi meum quod *inuolasti*,
sudariumque Saetabum catagraphosque Thynos. . . .
quae nunc tuis ab *unguibus* reglutina. . . .

mulier Ω — *aries*. O Ven. *alios* al. *aues* uel *aries*. G.
aues al. *aries* uel *alios*. R.
aues. BA. *alios*. e.g. Palermitanus. *ostendet*. OG_1.

No emendation can be said to hold the field. *munerarios* is explicitly declared by Quintilian (VIII. 3. 34) to be a word first used by Augustus. All other proposals recorded by Ellis in either edition are either far from the *ductus literarum* or fail to scan.

Of the variants *aries*, *aues*, *alios*, while none scans, the first alone makes nonsense and could have no construction. As this is given alone in O (and in *Ven.*, which is nearly related to R), it appears to be the text of the archetype; from it *aues* arises. *alios* is either from a further misreading *alies* or a gloss explaining *oscitantes*; *arios* is found only in the margin of L, and cannot have stood in V.

The type of rapacity was the kite; and here Thallus is figured as swooping (*inuolasti*) with talons (*unguibus*) and worse than a storm from the sky. Such passages as Cicero *Epist. ad Q. Fr.* I. 2. 6: *Licinium* plagiarium *cum suo* pullo miluino *tributa exigere*, or Petronius 75. 6, where Trimalchio turns upon Fortunata with '*milua*,' suggest that *mulier* in our context is a corruption of the vocative *milue*, applied to Thallus. (Cf. also Plautus *Pseud.* III. 2. 63; *Poen.* V. 5. 13. A. Palmer has proposed here *diua miluorum aues* . . . , but we

have seen the probability that *aues* is not a true reading, and surely *alias* would be a necessary addition for the sense.)

Thallus is under the special protection of some goddess, presumably Lauerna or Fortuna of thieves, unless a kite-headed goddess of Egypt be imagined. She points out a nodding slave or owner, and he swoops like a kite upon small birds. Where would Catullus drop his cloak, towels, and note-book together? Not at dinner so probably as at exercise: in *campus et areae* (Horace *C.* I. 9. 18). In *areae* the small birds are collected by the bird-catcher (Plautus *Asin.* I. 3. 64, 67: and cf. Cicero l.c.). The twofold line of approach suggests that *aries* in our context is a corruption of *areis*. The letters *e* and *i* are confused in the very next word, *ostendit* (*-et*, OG_1).

The presence of *aues* and of *alios* as variants is now explicable alternatively as due to the idea of the *miluus*. The scansion *milŭus*, *milŭo* survived down to Horace (*Epist.* I. 16. 51; *Epod.* 16. 32).

I propose, then, to read:

idemque, Thalle, turbida rapacior procella,
cum diua, milue, areis ostendit oscitantes . . .

The general use of *oscitantes* without a noun is defended by XII. 3: *tollis lintea neglegentiorum.*

XXIX. 20-24:

nunc Galliae timet(ur) et Britanniae.
quid hunc Lamum fouetis? aut quid hic potest
nisi uncta deuorare patrimonia?
eone nomine urbis † op(p)ulentissime †
socer generque, perdidistis omnia.

21. Lamum. Slater.
malum. Ω. hinc Ω.

The last verse was surely written to stand alone as a statement. It is quoted alone at *Catalepton* 3. 6:

ut *ille uersus* usquequaque pertinet:
'gener socerque, perdidistis omnia.'

If the verb of v. 23 is lost and v. 23 was a question by itself, then the statement in v. 24 had as much force as belongs to v. 10—after the series of questions preceding; and the sting in the tail is sharper. All restorations of v. 23 hitherto proposed weaken the sting of v. 24 by including it within the question *eone nomine . . .*?

Caesar remains at the ends of the earth, only that his creatures like Mamurra may gorge themselves. Mamurra is to devour even Gaul and Britain, the prizes of the *imperator unicus*. Caesar and Pompey are nurturing not a serpent but an ogre, who will eventually consume themselves.

I would explain *oppulentissime* as a rearrangement of the letters *éssulentŏppimi*, where an inversion of *words* was marked by one scribe and an inversion of *syllables* understood by the next.

The false spellings *oppimi* for *optimi* and *essulent* for *ecsulent* need no explanation. I would read:

eone nomine urbis optimi ecsulent?
socer generque, perdidistis omnia.

This is a poem of subtle echoes, and verses 11 and 12 are recalled:

eone nomine, imperator unice,
fuisti in ultima occidentis insula . . .

Catullus might pretend that he meant no more by vv. 23 and 24 than that Caesar and Pompey have *lost* all, as *aleones* playing with Mamurra, and that Caesar and his followers at the ends of the earth are the *urbis optimi* in exile. In this sense his *iambi* were almost *inmerentes* (LIV. 7). But he of course actually meant that they have *ruined* civic Rome and would allow all its best spirits to be driven into exile for the enrichment of a Mamurra. The *imperator unicus* and the *urbis optimi* are ironically contrasted; it is to the sting in the former phrase that he makes reference in LIV. 7.

XI. 9-12:

siue trans altas gradietur Alpes, | Caesaris uisens monimenta magni,
Gallicum Rhenum † horribilesque † ultimosque Britannos.

horribiles: R *Ven.* BLa[1], *multi.* horribilesque: GO.

That the *-que* stood in V appears certain. It appears at least probable, however, that it was an addition so written that the parent MS. of R and G threw doubt upon it. If the *-que* is a fragment of the true text, the most plausible correction is *horribilem sequi* (Housman). But V gave *bonisque malisque* for *bonis malisque* at XV. 10; and here there is the double chance that the *-que* is either a similar mistake due to the *-que* following, or a deliberate addition (unsatisfying, it is true) to mend the broken metre.

On the thesis that *horribilesultimosque* may have been a stage in the tradition, and that this arose from *horribilezesulultimosque*, I venture to propose:

Gallicum Rhenum horribilem ecsul *ultimosque Britannos.*

The verse is not rougher than vv. 19, 20, or XXVI. 5; and the horrors pile up well to their climax. I should quote Petronius *Bell. Ciuil.* 160-162, where Caesar is made to say of himself: *pulsus ab urbe mea dum Rhenum sanguine tinguo, dum Gallos iterum Capitolia nostra petentes Alpibus excludo, uincendo certior exul.* Also the verses discussed above: XXIX. 12 and 23.

I. 8:

quare habe tibi quidquid hoc libelli,
qualecumque † quod patrona uirgo †
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.

Catullus dedicates his book to Cornelius, and no second dedication to the Muse is tolerable within the limits of this poem. Bergk's *patron(e)i ut ergo*

seems to me absolutely certain. Cornelius bears *omne aeuum* on his back; through him will Catullus be *perennis*. For *patronei* corrupted to *patrona* cf. VII. 9, *basiei, basia;* LXVIII. 155. *satis* Ω, for *seitis*.

(*a*) If *quod* were sound, there could be but one way of further mending verse 9, *qualecumque, quod* <*est*>; and that was read by Avantius. That *quidem* stood in V as a variant for *quod* is hardly conceivable; for only R records it in the margin, and only D, suspect for many other supplements, puts it in its text.

(*b*) But there is a real variant from V, which had been overlooked. G records *mei* as a variant in V. for *libelli;* and *mei* stands for *libelli* in the text of *Vaticanus* 1630 (=Ellis's V, a MS of the B *gens* which I collated in 1906) and of La^2. We have, then, a supplemental word, of sufficient authority to misplace another which scans and construes, and a gap before *patronei* to be filled. This may be held to point to:

quod
qualecumque mei, patronei ut ergo. . . .

(This proposal appears as mine in the notes to the Loeb edition.)

Ellis quoted Censorinus *de die natali* I: *quodcumque hoc libri est, meis opibus comparatum . . . tibi misi.* I cannot join *mei* to *libelli*, but take it as genitive of the personal pronoun. *qualecumque mei* would correspond to *meis opibus comparatum:* 'this expression of myself imperfect though it be'. So Ovid with less humility in the *envoi* to *Amores* I. (xv. 42): *uiuam parsque mei multa superstes erit.* For a somewhat similar phrase cf. Propertius III. 21. 16: *qualiscumque mihi, tuque, puella, uale.*

quare habe tibi quicquid hoc libelli,
qualecumque mei, patronei ut ergo
plus uno maneat perenne saeclo.

I prefer this reading to that of Avantius; and unless one of them be true we have no assistance from the archetype.

LXVI. 15:

estne nouis nuptis odio Venus? atque † parentum †
frustrantur falsis gaudia lacrimulis . . .

No one will defend *parentum*, which has clearly replaced a word for the bridegroom, whose *gaudia* alone are in question (LXI. 109). But *maritum*, though possible, is not palaeographically convincing. On the analogy of passages such as Propertius *El.* IV. 3. 11, 12: noctis, cum rudis *urguenti* brachia *uicta* dedi, and in view of *uestigia rixae* here (13), I suggest *pr*<*em*>*entum*.

LV. 17:

nunc te lacteolae tenent puellae?
si linguam clauso † tenens † in ore,
fructus proicies amoris omnes.

If this were a carelessly written poem, we might tolerate *tenes* in v. 18

after *tenent* in v. 17. But the elaborate arrangement and balance of the poem as restored by Froehlich precludes such carelessness. [It falls into three parts, numerically arranged thus: (*a*) 2 | 3. 3. 4 || (*b*) 2 | 4. 3. 3 || (*c*) 2 | 1. 2. 1. 2. The first group of 3 in (*a*) is marked by the *te, te, te* of vv. 3-5; the group of 4 in (*b*) by the *non, non, non, non* of vv. 1*a*-4*a*, and the fall of the other divisions in (*b*) by the vocatives *amice, Cameri, amice,* in the last verse of each group. Again, the spondaic second feet are equal in number to the dactylic, and are so distributed that the proportion is 8 : 4 in (*a*) and 4 : 8 in (*b*), while in (*c*) they are alternate.]

I propose *teres* (if *si* stands); or, if *sic* be accepted from Birt, *terens*.

LXVIII. (*b*):

(1) *Structure of the Poem.*—The large lines are clear. LXVIII. (*a*), vv. 1-40, is a fragment of a separate poem addressed to 'Mallius' not 'Allius.' In it the poet excuses himself from writing such a poem as Mallius in his grief has invited, and that on the ground of his own grief at his brother's death. In vv. 41-160 we have just such a poem as Catullus would have written to Mallius, if he had been in the mood (and if he had had his books with him, 33-40). It contains passages jocular and erotic and a myth *ueterum dulci scriptorum carmine* (7). He can detach himself from his grief to amuse a friend, but comes back to it at the incidental mention of Troy in v. 88. The period of LXVIII. (*b*) is thus a little later than that of LXVIII. (*a*).

The separate poem LXVIII. (*b*) (vv. 41 to 160) has a prologue and epilogue chiefly about 'Allius'—vv. 41-50 (*A*) and 149-160 (*B*); a central myth, vv. 73-130, with a passage on Troy interpolated by the author (vv. 89-104); and before and after the myth an autobiographical passage chiefly about Catullus's love for his mistress—vv. 51-72 (*C*) and 131-148 (*D*).

(*A*) The prologue (41-50) has 4+6 verses (v. 47 lost). It would have balanced the epilogue, if two verses are granted to have been lost at the beginning. Before v. 41 there has undoubtedly been lost *at least* the conclusion of the preceding poem LXVIII. (*a*).

(*B*) The epilogue (149-160) is complete in 12 verses, arranged 6+6.

(*C*) has 22 verses, arranged as 6+6+10 (7+3).

(*D*) has 18 verses, arranged as 10 (7+3)+2+6.

Between vv. 141 and 142 an even number of verses has been lost; if these were *four* in number, (*D*) would balance (*C*).

The myth itself is composed as follows: It begins (73-86) with 14 verses, arranged as $4+2, +\overset{\frown}{8}\{^{6+2}$. It ends (117-130) with 14 verses, arranged as 2, +6+4, +2. The intervening passage, as it stands, appears to divide at v. 100 into sections of 14 and 16 verses (87-100 and 101-116), arranged as 4, +6+4 and 4, +6+8. Once admit, however, the possibility that the interpolated verses on the brother's death at Troy are outside the original scheme, we notice that vv. 101-104 are merely an expansion of vv. 87, 88, contrived to

bring us back to our subject after the personal digression. The original scheme then seems to have included only vv. 87, 88 and 105-116, or another group of 14 *verses*, arranged as 2,+4+8 (cf. 73-86). Or alternatively vv. 87-90 belong to an original scheme 14+16+14.

I submit that there is a strong probability that *two* verses of this poem have been lost before v. 41 and four verses after v. 141. I postulate that one whole *page* at least of the archetype had perished before v. 41. (On another occasion I hope to put forward my theory as to the pagination and arrangement of this archetype.) For my view of the formal schemes of composition inherited by the Roman elegists from Callimachus and others, I refer readers to my article on Propertius in the *Classical Quarterly* for April, 1918.

Whether the interpolated verses on Troy and his brother's death were 14 or 16 in number, they break the formal scheme proposed. They are brought in at the very heart of the poem, and the scheme calls attention to them. Particular attention is called to certain of the verses because they are repeated from LXVIII. (*a*). The brother's death is shown to be an obsession. But I now further submit that the modern reader has an advantage here over 'Allius,' unless *he* also had read LXVIII. (*a*). What then if he was actually the same person as 'Mallius'? What if this actually *is* the poem he failed to write for 'Mallius' a short while before?

The scheme of LXVIII. (*a*) 1-40 is 14+12+14 to the break. This would not balance any part of LXVIII. (*b*), which is thus again shown to be a separate poem.

(2) *Prologue and Epilogue*, (*A*) and (*B*).—The prologue is a ludicrous piece of exaggeration. Catullus's poem is to give 'Allius' ever-increasing fame during his lifetime (v. 47 to this effect has however unkindly perished) and compound interest after death (48). But surely there is a pun on *allium*. His *name* must not be allowed to grow mouldy (151) at the touch of *haec atque illa dies*, atque alia atque alia. The *sublimis aranea* is not to spin round his deserted *name* (50). I catch a suggestion of strings of *allium* hanging from an outhouse roof. On 152 follows the reference to the coarse fruits of the earth offered of old to Themis. (Compare Varro *apud Non.* 201. 9: *ataui nostri, cum alium ac caepe eorum uerba olerent, tamen optime animati erant.*)

I submit that this punning, and the nature of the services of Allius which Catullus describes in vv. 69 and 156, render it likely that 'Allius' is a pseudonym. The name is first introduced with an *m'* before it: *qua m(e) Allius* (41). I regard 'Mallius' as the man intended (see above [1]).

vv. 125-158 I read thus: *seitis felices et tu simul et tua uita,* | *et domus in qua* <una> *lusimus et domina,* | *et qui principio nobis terram dedit* Auster, | *a quo sunt primo omnia nata bona . . .*

157. aufert. *codd.*

For *una* lost after *qua* cf. v. 69 *communes*. My proposal *Auster*, recorded in the Loeb text, I support as follows:

'Allius' came to Catullus (64) as a favouring breeze, *lenius aspirans*, when he was almost shipwrecked. (Incidentally this is the figure used by Mallius in his appeal to Catullus, v. 3.) He gave him space to manoeuvre in (*campum*, 67). From Cicero *ad Fam.* XVI. 9. austro lenissimo, *caelo sereno, nocte illa et die postero in Italiam ad Hydruntem ludibundi peruenimus*, one infers that Auster though stormy was on occasion a favourable wind with which to make Italy from Greece. Compare an almost figurative use in *ad Att.* XVI. 7. 5: *ego uero* austro gratias miras *qui me a tanta infamia auerterit.* 'Allius' brought Catullus to land, *terram dedit;* and then *patefecit campum* (67). *Auster* is figurative; 'the ill wind that blew me good and brought my ship home.' For a similar figure cf. *nobis* Aquilo, *Cynthia, uentus erit* (Propertius II. 5. 4.).

(3) vv. 51-72.—I venture to think that this passage would be greatly improved by a transposition of stanzas (see above [1]). The simile of the mountain brook (vv. 57-62) should follow v. 72. Catullus's floods of tears (56) cannot be properly likened to a brook which relieves and *cools* (see vv. 53, 54) the traveller and the parched lands and passes through a populous city. Nor can this figure be harmonized with vv. 63-65 as a simile for Allius's service, whereas vv. 63-65 would follow easily upon v. 56. On the other hand, the figure of the mountain brook is very beautiful after 72, if applied to the *molli candida diua pede* descending from her height to gleam and rustle (*arguta solea*) upon the worn threshold (71) of the town house (*densi populi*) and refresh the parched wanderer within.

(4) vv. 117, 118:

> sed tuus altus amor barathro fuit altior illo,
> qui † tuum domitum † ferre iugum docuit.

I retract the suggestion recorded against me in the Loeb text and now argue as follows. Is the final section (117-130) of the Laodamia myth to bring no reference to the most important detail of the myth from a lover's point of view? *illic Phylacides iucundae coniugis heros | non potuit caecis immemor esse locis, | sed cupidus falsis attingere gaudia palmis | Thessalis antiquam* uenerat umbra domum: Propertius *Cynthia* XX. (XIX.) 7-10. '*Si comes exstincti manes sequerere mariti, | esset dux facti Laodamia tui*': Ovid *P.* 3. 1. 109.

Verses 117, 118 and 129, 130 ought to refer to the union of the lovers after death; and the lack of such reference in the text should guide our correction of v. 118. Laodamia's love was deeper than the abyss of Hercules' delving; it pierced through to Hades itself. Protesilaus untamed in the tomb was tamed by that love of hers,

> *qui* tumulo indomitum *ferre iugum docuit.*

Here *loī-* was lost before *doī-*, and *tumu-* became *tuum*. The late-born grandchild of the aged (119) is like a return from the grave, but gives less joy than did he to her.

O. L. Richmond.

The University, Edinburgh.

THE GREEK ADJECTIVES ENDING IN -ης.

It is generally assumed that every adjective ending in -ης is an *s*-stem like εὐγενής (gen. εὐγενοῦς from εὐγενέ(σ)-ος ; cf. γένος gen. γένε(σ)-ος, Lat. *genus gener-is*, Skr. *janas janas-as*) or δυσμενής (: μένος ; cf. Skr. *dur-manās* gen. *dur-manas-as*). Solmsen, for instance, does not hesitate (*Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung* 16) to regard ὁμ-ηγερής (πολυ-ηγερής, θυμ-ηγερής) as evidence for the *s*-stem *geres* which he wishes to find in ἀγοστός (ἀγο(ρ)σ-τός), and Bechtel (*Lexilogus* 274) infers a stem παγεσ- from ὑπερπαγής. The result of this well-nigh universal belief[1] has been that hardly anybody has thought it worth while to examine these words carefully.

While it may be admitted that a large number of adjectives ending in -ης are *s*-stems, the following facts may serve to show how impossible it is to analyse them all in that way, and how easily many of them lend themselves to other explanations.

It does not seem to have been noticed how often an adjective ending in -ης is accompanied by an Aorist Passive in -ῆναι. I have observed the following cases of this parallelism :

Γυναιμανής (Hom.) : μανῆναι.
τηλεφανής (Hom.) : φανῆναι.
ἀρισφαλής (Hom.) : σφαλῆναι.
ἡμιδαής 'half-burnt' (Hom.). The corresponding Aorist occurs only in Hesychius : ἐκδαϝῇ · ἐκκαυθῇ (emended by Ahrens).
ὀρθοδαής (Aesch.) : ἐδάην (Hom.).
περικαής Hippocr. *Epidem.* VI. 14 (V. 274 Littré), cf. πυρικαής Hippocr. *Epidem.* VI. 2, 10 (V. 282 Littré) : ἐκάην.
μεσσοπαγής (Hom.) : παγῆναι.
ἀαγής[2] 'unbreakable' (Hom. λ 575) : (ϝ)αγῆναι (Hom.). Aor. of ἄγνυμι.
μελοτυπής (Aesch.) : ἐτύπην (Hom.).
ἀσαπέως Hippocr. περὶ διαίτης ὀξέων 16 (I. 116, 20 Kühlewein) : ἐσάπην (Hom.).
τριχορρυής (Aesch. fr. 275) : ῥυῆναι (Aesch. etc.).

[1] W. Schulze's observation (*Quaestiones Epicae*, p. 254, note 4) that φειδώ : ἀφειδής is a case of ē/ō ablaut is one of the rare admissions that an adjective ending in -ής can be anything but an *s*-stem. Another is Wackernagel's analysis of ἀγκυλο-χήλης. I return later to these views and to those of Bechtel (on δυσαής).

[2] The second α is probably short, although ἀαγές stands at the end of a hexameter in λ 575, and W. Schulze (*Quaest. Epicae*, 436) thinks that ἀᾱγής might be defended. The line λ 575 is metrically exceptional, and ends in ∪∪∪ (on such lines see Schulze l. c.), Sophocles, who has κυματοᾱγής, *Oed. Col.* 1243, did not know that.

εὐσταλής (Aesch. Soph. Thuc.): στα̃λῆναι (Pind. etc.).
παμμιγής (Aesch.): ἐμίγην (Hom.).
αἱμορραγής (Soph.): ἐρράγην (Soph. etc.).
ἐυρραφής (Hom.): ῥαφῆναι (Eur. etc.).
νεοζυγής (Aesch.): ζυγῆναι (Pind. Trag.).
ἀκαρής[1] 'indivisible' (ἐν ἀκαρεῖ 'in an instant') (Aristoph. etc.): καρῆναι (κείρω).
αἱμοσταγής (Aesch.): ἐστάγην (this Aorist however is very late).
παλινστραφής (Soph. Ἰχν. 112): στραφῆναι.
εὐτραφής[2] (Trag. Hippocr. Plato.): τραφῆναι (τρέφω).
ἑτεροκλινής (Hippocr. Μοχλ. 14; II. 253, 18 Kühlewein): κλινῆναι.
μιλτηλιφής (Hdt.): ἀλιφῆναι (Plato).
δημορριφής (Aesch.): ῥιφῆναι (Plato etc.).
ἐπιχαρής (Aesch.): ἐχάρην, κεχαρηώς.
νεοσφαγής (Soph.): σφαγῆναι (Trag. etc.).
φρενοπληγής (Aesch.): πληγῆναι (Hom.).
καταπλαγής (Polyb.): καταπλαγῆναι (Trag. etc.).
ψευδαγγελής (Aristoph. *Av.* 1340): ἀγγελῆναι (first in Euripides, *I.T.* 932).
κατασκαφής (Soph.): ἐσκάφην (Trag.).
πολυβαφής (Aesch.): ἐβάφην (Plato, Hippocr.).
ὀστρειογραφής Mamercus (Bergk, *P.L.G.* p. 501): γραφῆναι.
ἀτριβής (Thuc.): τριβῆναι (Aristoph. etc.).
εὐφυής (Hom.): ἐφύην (found as early as Hippocrates).
ἡμιβραχής, ἐλαιοβραχής, εὐβραχής and other words in which -βραχής alternates with -βρεχής are given by Lobeck, *Phryn.* 577. They are all late. The forms in -βραχής may be compared with ἐβράχην, those in -βρεχής with ἐβρέχην. These Aorists of βρέχω are discussed by Solmsen (*Glotta* II. 313).
εἰληθερής (or ἐλιθερής) occurs in Hippocr. περὶ νούσων II. 27 (VII. 44 Littré): τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν φύλλων εἰληθερές 'la préparation susdite des feuilles chaude' (Littré) and again in II. 30 (VII. 48 Littré). Cf. ἐλιθερὲς, τὸ ὡς ἀπὸ ἡλίου θερμόν Galen *Gloss.* Perhaps θερέω Hom. *Od.* 17, 23 (subjunct. of ἐθέρην) should be compared.

In my opinion this parallelism arises from the fact that many of these adjectives are not *s*-stems but *ē*-stems (like the Fifth Declension in Latin). Γυναιμανής contains the same stem μανη- as ἐ-μάνη-ν.

The existence of *ē*-stems in Greek was first asserted by Bechtel (*Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* 1886, pp. 378-381; cf. *Ion. Inschriften* 66*). He pointed especially to the declension Ἄρης acc. Ἄρην gen. Ἄρεω (Archi-

[1] The connexion of ἀκαρής with κείρω was perceived by the ancients (see Solmsen, *Beiträge zur griech. Wortforschung*, p. 162 footnote).

[2] Τραφῆναι is first found in Tragedy. Homer has only ἔτραφον, which he uses in a passive sense, v. Solmsen, *Glotta* II. 311 (after Ph. Buttmann). With this fact the Homeric preference for -τρεφής (ἀνεμο-τρεφής and many others) may be connected.

lochus fragm. 48), to the Boeotian proper names in -ει, Ἀθανίκκει, Ἀκύλλει, etc., and to the Ionic genitive forms ἱέρεω and μύκεω. He supposed that on the one hand the old Greek ē-stems had become confused with and absorbed by the ēu-stems (ἱερής by ἱερεύς, Τύδης by Τύδευς, etc.), while, on the other, misinterpretation of the existing forms of ē-stems gave rise to new analogical forms—*e.g.*, ζαής (an *s*-stem according to Bechtel) acquired the acc. ζαήν in accordance with the proportion Ἄρης Ἄρην and similarly many other *s*-stems acquired accusatives in -ην.

By 1908 Bechtel had apparently come to perceive that among the adjectives in -ής some were ē-stems originally, and not merely pseudo ē-stems arising from analogy. He perceived this in the case of the words in -αής. In his book on *Vowel Contraction in Homer* (p. 56) he notes that the acc. ζαήν and the gen. δυσαήων contain the original η- of the stem, which is also the stem of ἄη-μι. That his perception of the truth about the adjectives in -ής had not got beyond this stage even in 1914 is proved by the already mentioned fact that in his *Lexilogus zu Homer* (published in that year) he infers from ὑπερπαγής a stem παγεσ-, and by his latest (pre-war) pronouncement on ē-stems (*Lexilogus*, p. 59).

It is clear that there was a close relationship, whatever its origin may have been, between a number of adjectives in -ής and the corresponding Aorist Passive forms. This relationship gave rise, moreover, to a number of analogical formations. For instance, ψευδαγγελής cannot be anything but an analogical formation from ἀγγελῆναι, since ἀγγελῆναι does not give ground for assuming an old ē-stem ἀγγελη-, being itself a recent analogical formation, as is proved by the fact that it is one of the only two second Aorist Passive forms from a denominative verb (the other being ἀλλαγῆναι). This influence of the Aorist forms on the adjectives at a late date is further proved by καταπλαγής and ἐκπλαγής. In early Greek, where we find ἐπλήγην, we also find φρενοπληγής. Καταπλαγής and ἐκπλαγής betray their analogical origin from πλαγῆναι in four ways: (1) by their agreement with it in the short *a*; (2) by their late occurrence (not before Polybius); (3) by the coincidence in the choice of preposition with ἐκπλαγῆναι and καταπλαγῆναι; (4) by their passive and verbal meaning. The behaviour of the words in -τρεφής (-τραφής) and -βρεχής (-βραχής)—see above—must also be due to this analogical accommodation of the adjective to the Aorist form.

For the purpose of estimating whether in an individual case we have before us an analogical formation or a real original ē-stem the following list of the other words containing the same end-element as those mentioned above may be of value:

Besides γυναιμανής (Hom.) there are θεομανής, φρενομανής, ἱπποµανής, δοριμανής, θυρσομανής (all occurring in Tragedy), ἡλιομανής, χορομανής (Aristoph.). All of these have a noun as first element. Ἀκρομανής (Hdt.) has an adjective, and ἐμμανής (Aesch.) a preposition (or adverb). Any of these might contain an old ē-stem noun *μανη-ς (formed like Lat. *fides*).

Besides τηλεφανής (Hom.) there are only words beginning with a preposition (or adverb): ἀφανής (Sappho 68 etc.), ἐμφανής (Pind. etc.), ἐπιφανής (Pind.), διαφανής, καταφανής (Aristoph.), προφανής (Hippocr. Thuc. etc.), συμφανής (Aristotle, Polyb. etc.). The existence of ἐπιφανῆναι, διαφανῆναι, etc., suggests an analogical origin for most of these words.

Besides ἀρισφαλής (Hom.) there are ἀσφαλής (Hom. etc.), ἐπισφαλής (Plato etc.), δομοσφαλής (Aesch.), ἀκροσφαλής (Polyb.).

Besides ἡμιδαής 'half-burnt' (Hom.), we have θεσπιδαής (Hom.).

Besides ὀρθοδαής (Aesch.) we have αὐτοδαής and ἀδαής (Soph. etc.).

Besides μεσσοπαγής we have πρωτοπαγής (Hom.), δοριπαγής (Aesch.), γομφοπαγής (Aristoph.), ἀπαγής (πῖλος) (Hdt.).

Besides τριχορρυής (Aesch.) we have γονορρυής LXX. cf. πτεροῤῥυεῖν (Aristoph.), τριχορρυεῖν *id.* and (with a preposition) καταῤῥυής (Soph.).

Besides παμμιγής we have πολυμιγής, συμμιγής (Aesch.), ἀμιγής (Plato etc.).

Besides αἱμορραγής we have διχορραγής, ψυχορραγής (Eur.) πυρορραγής (Aristoph.) ἀρραγής (Hippocr.).

Besides ἐυρραφής we have λινορραφής (Aesch.).

Besides αἱμοσταγής we have δειματοσταγής (Aesch.), νεκταροσταγής (Com.).

Besides παλινστραφής we have ἀστραφής and ἀμφιστραφής. Παλινστραφής is no doubt coined by Sophocles, the combination *-νστρ-* being unheard of in a genuine old Greek word.

Besides ἑτεροκλινής we have κατακλινής (Hippocr.), συγκλινής (Aesch fr. 84), ἀκλινής (LXX.).

Besides μιλτηλιφής we have διηλιφής (Soph.[1]).

Besides δημορριφής we have πετρορριφής (Eur.), χαμαιριφής (Eur. *Bacch.* 1111). This last is on a par with παλινστραφής, the first element being not a bare stem but a complete word.

Besides ἐπιχαρής we have περιχαρής (Soph. Ar. etc.), ὑπερχαρής (Polyb.).

Besides νεοσφαγής we have αὐτοσφαγής (Eur.).

Besides πολυβαφής we have κροκοβαφής (Aesch.), αἱμοβαφής (Soph.).

Besides ἀτριβής we have νεοτριβής (Pseudo-Phocyl. 155), οἰκοτριβής (Critias 2. 14, *Bgk.*), παλιντριβής (Soph.), ἐντριβής (Soph.).

Besides εὐφυής we find προσφυής (Hom.), ἐμφυής (Pind.), διφυής (Soph.), ἀφυής (Soph.), ἐλαιοφυής, ὀδοντοφυής, λεοντοφυής (Eur.), ὑπερφυής (Aristoph. etc.), στενοφυής (Alexis etc.).

It will scarcely be maintained that in all these cases of parallelism with the Aorist Passive we are dealing with analogical formations from the Aorist. There seems therefore to be no escape from the conclusion that the parallelism affords proof of the existence of Greek *ē*-stem nouns.

I have reserved for special consideration the word νεαλής 'newly caught' with its congeners δουριαλής and the adverb εὐαλῶς, which Hesychius trans-

[1] Herodian, περὶ ὀρθογραφίας, II. p. 473 (Lentz), quotes ὑπηλιφής and ἀνυπηλιφής. Eustathius, *Od.* 1561, says: ἀνηλιφὴς ναῦς ἡ μὴ ἀλιφεῖσα πίσσῃ, καὶ πισσαλιφὴς, ἡ πεπισσωμένη.

lates into εὐχερῶς θηρώμενος. (These three words are combined by Baunack, *Philologus* 73, 36 f.) Here also we recognise a relation to a Passive Aorist, viz., ἁλῶναι. It is a case of ē/ō ablaut: ἁλη- : ἁλω-.

Wackernagel (*Dehnungsgesetz* 4) has shown that ὑγιής is composed of ὑ = Skr. *su-* 'well' and the root of βίος 'life.' It is now possible to analyse -γιής more exactly: -γιής stands to βιῶναι as -αλής (in νεαλής) to ἁλῶναι. Moreover ὑγιη-ρός has preserved its original η.

It is tempting to recognise in ἀιδής—(1) unseen, (2) blind—the ē-stem of *uidere*. Ἀτενής (cf. ἐκτενής ἁλιτενής βυρσοτενής σχοινοτενής) may contain the stem of Lat. *tenere*. Ἀφραδής (cf. ἀριφραδής δολοφραδής πολυφραδής εὐφραδής κακοφραδής περιφραδής) may contain the same stem as Lith. *girdē-ti* 'to hear'; this would confirm the well-known identification of φράζω (φράζομαι) with *girdžiu* 'I hear.' The word ἀθερές (neut.) which Hesychius explains by ἀνόητον, ἀνόσιον, ἀκριβές (Leo Meyer, *Etym.* I. 163) may contain the same stem as Lith. *derē-ti* 'to suit, be fit for, be of use': ἀθερής would originally have meant 'useless' and ἀθερίζω 'to deem useless.' Others, however, connect ἀθερίζω with Skr. *ádhara-* (L. Meyer, *Vgl. Gramm.* II. 53; Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 15).

Brugmann has identified the ē of Lat. *fides* with that of πιθήσω (*Grundriss* II². 1. p. 220). We may add that *fides* is to be identified with the second element of εὐ-πιθής. He has also shown that many Latin third declension words in -ēs, which were supposed by some to be *s*-stems, are really ē-stems, e.g. *sēdēs*, which has the same stem as Lith. *sēdē-ti* 'to sit.' I would add *sub-ŏles* and *prōlēs* (*prŏ-ŏlēs*), which have the stem of *ad-olēre* 'to grow,' cf. νεαλής 'young, fresh.' The *ol-* of *ad-olēre* comes from *al-* (see Walde, *Etymolog. Wörterbuch*, s.v. *alo*), and *alē-* is as it were a passive of Lat. *alo*. The identification of -πηγής in εὐ-πηγής, καινο-πηγής, μελαμ-πᾱγής with Lat. *-pāgēs* (third decl.) in *compāgēs*, so far from being an obstacle to Brugmann's theory (as it must have been from his point of view) confirms it, both words being ē-stems.

Sometimes the ē is observable in the Greek conjugation though not in the Aorist Passive. For instance, ἀᾰδής (*Theognis* 296 as emended by Brunck) has the ē of ἀδήσω, fut. of ἀνδάνω (cf. αὐθᾰδης, Ionic αὐτώδης, from αὐτο-ᾰδης, Schulze, *Quaest. Epicae*. p. 453); ἐπιδευής that of δευήσομαι, cf. ἐνδεής ἐπιδεής ἀνεπιδεής ἀπροσδεής ὑπερδεής which have the ē of δεήσει. The same principle can be applied to ἀμελής (: μελή-σει); πατροστερής (cf. ὀμματοστερής ἀργυροστερής ἡλιοστερής βιοστερής): στερήσω; and to προαυξής and ἀναυξής (Hippocr.), cf. αὐξήσω. The η of νεοαρδής is perhaps related to that of ἀρδη-θμός.

As has been mentioned already, Schulze observes (*Quaest. Epicae*, p. 254, note 4) that φειδώ stands to ἀφειδής in the same relation as αἰδώς to ἀναιδής, i.e. it is a case of ē/ō ablaut. On the same principle one may connect ἀπειθής with πειθώ, ἀπευθής with πευθώ (unless Avestan *baoδah-* has a prior claim), and πολυηχής (ὑψηχής) with ἠχώ. Sometimes the noun in -ώ has been replaced by

one in *-ω-λή* (cf. *φειδώ* : *φειδωλή*), e.g. *ἀελπής* : *ἐλπωρή* (for **ἐλπωλή*); *ἀτερπής* : *τερπωλή*; *δυσθαλπής* : *θαλπωρή* (but also *τὸ θάλπος*); *ἀμεμφής* : *μεμφωλή*; perhaps also *νηλεής* is similarly related to *ἀλεωρή*. Schulze, *K.Z.* 29, 262 and *Quaest. Epicae*, p. 289, distinguishes *νᾱλεFής* 'inevitable, *ἄφυκτος*' from *νηλεής* 'pitiless.'

Wackernagel's analysis of *ἀτειρής* as *ἀ-τερσ-ής* (*τέρσομαι*)—*Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 16—may be right. If it is an *ē*-stem, *τερσή-μεναι* should be compared.

Ἀλής 'assembled' (cf. *ἅλία* 'assembly,' *ἀλία* on the Heraclean Tables) may stand for *sm -Fᾰλής* 'massed together' and be thus related to the Aorist Passive *Fαλῆναι* (: *εἰλέω* Dor. *Fηλέω* from *Fελ-νέω*). Similarly the Elean word *ἀFλανέως* (implying *ἀFλανής*) may, if the second *α* is short, be related to a hypothetical *ἐ-Fλᾰ́-ν-ην*, Aorist Passive of this same **Fελ-νέω*, as *ἀκλινής* to *ἐ-κλί-ν-ην*. But the problem is complicated by the existence of *ἀολλής* and *ἀελλής*, cf. Solmsen, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 285 ff.

Especial significance attaches to *εὐσταθής*, as it contains the enigmatic *θ* of the *-θην* Aorist. *Εὐσταθής* and *ἐστάθην* are both found in Homer. If Wackernagel's theory of the *-θην* Aorist is right (viz. that it began in the second person sing. and *ἐ-δό-θη-ς* = Skr. *a-di-thā-ḥ*) then *εὐσταθής* must be an analogical formation from *ἐστάθην*. But no sooner is *εὐσταθής* thus disposed of than the *θ* reappears in *σταθερός*. This might, it is true, be an analogical formation from *σταθῆναι* according to the relation *βλαβερός* : *βλαβῆναι*, *τακερός* : *τακῆναι*, *σφαλερός* : *σφαλῆναι*, *φανερός* : *φανῆναι*. But when two such assumptions have to be made, both of them become less probable. We may also ask, *en passant*, whether *εὐσταθής* contains the Indo-Eur. suffix *-dhē-* which Thurneysen finds in Lat. *pūbēs* (see Walde, *Wörterbuch*, s.v.).

The extent to which new adjectives in *-ής* were formed at a late date according to the most various analogies has been greatly underestimated. I have already mentioned that Wackernagel (*K.Z.* 29) recognised that *ἀγκυλοχείλης* (correct spelling *ἀγκυλοχήλης*), *ἑτεραλκής* and *εὐρυπυλής* are simply formed from *χήλη ἀλκή πύλη*. Additional examples of this type are: *νεηκονής*, Soph. *Ajax* 820 (: *ἀκόνη*); *ἀκαλυφής*, Soph. (cf. *περικαλυφή*, Plato, *Laws* 242 D); *κυαναυγής*, Eur. (*αὐγή*); *ἀναυδής*, Epicrat. (*Com.*) 3, 371, Meineke; *ἐπαναγκής*, Menander 4, 249, (Meineke) and Koinè inscriptions, e.g. *G.D.I.* 3749$_{38}$; *πολυπλανής*, Eur. (*πλάνη*); *χρυσολαβὲς ἐγχειρίδιον*, Menander 4, 77, Meineke (*λαβή*); *περιπτυχής*, Soph. (*πτυχή*); *περιοργής*, Thuc. (*ὀργή*); *συναφής*, Hippocr. *ἀναφής*, Plato (*ἀφή*); *ἀγεννής*, Eur. *θεογεννής*, Soph. (*γέννα*); perhaps also *νεήκης προήκης ἀμφήκης ξυρήκης* (: *ἀκή*) and *πλινθυφής ταναυφής εὐυφής* (*ὑφή* but cf. *ὕφος*). There is therefore no objection on the score of word-formation to Buttmann's combination of *ὀξυπευκής* (*ἐχεπευκής*, *περιπευκής*) with *πεύκη*.

Several of the words which I have compared with Aorist Passive forms can also be referred to a fem. *ā*-stem, e.g. *ἀαγής* to *ἀγή* 'breakage'; *αἱμορραγής* to *ῥαγή* 'eruption,' Hippocr. (cf. *κατάρραγή*, *διαρραγή* id.); *εὐρραφής* to *ῥαφή*;

δημορριφής to ῥιφή (Lycophron); ἐπιχαρής to χαρά (Ionic χαρή); νεοσφαγής to σφαγή; φρενοπληγής to πληγή; κατασκαφή to σκαφή; πολυβαφής to βαφή; ὀστρειογραφής to γραφή; νεοτριβής to τριβή; εὐφυής to φυή.

Which of these explanations is right in each case, e.g. whether αἱμορραγής is related more closely to ῥαγῆναι or to ῥαγή, is a matter on which a decision is not always possible, though close study of the forms and meanings sometimes affords a clue, e.g. στενοφυής is clearly formed from φυή, not from φυῆναι. Dates must also be considered, e.g. νεοζυγής (Aesch.) can scarcely have been formed from -ζυγή, which is first found in the Koinè word ἀναζυγή.

What is clear is that an adjective in -ής (or several such) which at first belonged closely to an Aorist Passive form, came to be regarded as derived from a fem. ā-stem which happened to exist alongside of it, and then νεηκονής and such words began to be formed from fem. ā-stems of all kinds according to the pattern thus created.

This seems to have happened not only in Ionic-Attic (where the nouns in question ended in -ή for the most part and not in -ά) but also in dialects which preserved the original -ā. This theory, if correct, provides a new explanation of certain Doric names ending in -νίκης, especially Λανίκης[1] on an old inscription of Thera, *G.D.I.* 4805. Until recently it was customary to refer these names in -νίκης to τὸ νῖκος, the Hellenistic equivalent of νίκη. Wackernagel, however, has explained νῖκος as a contamination of νίκη and νεῖκος and therefore not older than the date when ει became ī. Fraenkel therefore rightly hesitates (*Glotta* IV. 40) to find this Hellenistic τὸ νῖκος in so old a name as Λανίκης, or in the Arcadian K]λ(ε)ονίκεος (gen.) in *G.D.I.* 1231 *b* 8. His own theory that these names were originally *o*-stems (nom. sing. ending in -νικος) and were then assimilated to those in -σθένης and -κράτης, has no plausibility. I see no difficulty in supposing that Λανίκης was formed from νίκα after ἀριφραδής had come to be regarded as formed from φραδά.

Another class of analogically-formed adjectives in -ής is constituted by those which accompany a Second Aorist Active. The following list contains most, if not all, of those which are to be met with in the earliest Greek.

θυμοδακής (Hom.) ὠμοδακής (Aesch.) cf. ἔδακον.

διιπετής (Hom.) διοπετής (Eur.) γονυπετής (Eur.) κλινοπετής (Hippocr.) δυσπετής (Hippocr.) εὐπετής (Hippocr., Hdt., etc.) χαμαιπετής (Aesch.) δακρυοπετής (Eur.) δοριπετής (φόνος) (Eur.) περιπετής (Eur.) cf. Doric ἔπετον 'I fell'.

βαρυπεσής (Aesch.) (: ἔπεσον).

δορικανής (Aesch.) πολυκανής (Aesch.) (: ἔκανον 'I slew').

δυσμαθής (Aesch.) εὐμαθής (Aesch.) ἀμαθής (Eur.) ἀρτιμαθής (Eur.) (: ἔμαθον).

εὐλαβής (Attic prose) μεσολαβής (Aesch.) (: ἔλαβον).

[1] The ā-stems ending in -νίκης (-νίκᾱς) are quite distinct. On their history see E. Fraenkel, *Nomina Agentis*, II. 98.

ἀνδροτυχής, εὐτυχής, κακοτυχής, ἐπιτυχής (: ἔτυχον, unless some of these are formed from τύχη).

ἀχανής (Hegesipp. 4, 480 Mein. etc.) (: ἔχανον).

εὐδρακής (Soph.) (: ἔδρακον).

ἐλλιπής (Plato, etc.) περιλιπής (Polyb.) (: ἔλιπον).

ἀρτιθανής (Eur.) δισθανής (Hom.) (: ἔθανον). Bechtel, *Lexilogus* 103, calls δισθανής an incorrect formation, and says it ought to have been διθανής. The fact observed by Bechtel is an additional proof that the word is formed by analogy. We find a complete word, and not merely a stem, as first element in other analogical formations as well, e.g, χαμαιριφής, χαμαιπετής, τηλεφανής, παλινστραφής, παλιντριβής, παλιμβλαστής, and also in the only other compound of -θανής, viz. ἀρτιθανής.

ἀμφιβαλής (Eur.) (: ἔβαλον).

παλιμβλαστής (: ἔβλαστον).

συμπαθής (Polyb.) ἐκπαθής (Polyb.) ἀπαθής (passim) αἰνοπαθής (Hom.).

κληροπαλής (*Hymn to Mercury*) δυσπαλής (Aesch.) cf. πεπαλών.

ἀκραγής (Aesch.) (: ἔκραγον).

τιμαλφής (Aesch.) (ἀλφεῖν).

The starting-point of such formations may have been provided by the words in -παθής. Wackernagel (*Vermischte Beiträge*, p. 16) shows that αἰνοπαθής is a compound of πένθος, and gives other examples in which the penultimate syllable has the weak grade (to his examples add ἀδιής [: δέος = δϝέγος] *G.D.I.* 4801 Thera, Hoffmann *ad loc.*)

The relation of πένθος to -πn̥θής was lost sight of after the sonant nasal had become α, and it was naturally assumed that -παθής was derived from παθεῖν.

Προσφιλής (κοινοφιλής, θεοφιλής, εὐφιλής, δυσφιλής) and βροτοστυγής (θεοστυγής)—all fifth-century words—are perhaps analogically formed from ἐφίλη-σα ἐστύγη-σα at a date when ἀκρατής had become detached from κράτος and attached to κρατεῖν, or εὐθαρσής to θαρσεῖν.

Finally, the neuters in -ος, to which so much respect has been paid in the past, are not always so very ancient. In fact, some of them, instead of being older than the corresponding adjective in -ής, may have been formed from it, as πάθος is admitted to be at least influenced by αἰνο-παθής. No one will now maintain that τὸ μάθος is a very old word, in view of the ease with which it could be analogically formed from ἀμαθής. Other words in -ος seem to have replaced feminine nouns in -ώ. At any rate the form τὸ ἄχος could easily be understood as an analogical formation from ἄχεος, ἄχεϊ, and these may belong originally to ἠχώ. Schulze (*Quaest. Epicae*, p. 254 note 4) shows that the -ώ nouns once had ablaut : Γοργώ : Γοργεῖος (= Γοργεγ-ιος), φειδώ : ἀφειδής.

RODERICK MCKENZIE.

SIPARVM AND *SVPPARVS.*

A STUDENT who looks out *siparum* in the dictionary is sent on to *supparum*. Forcellini: '*sīpărum* et *sīpărus* et *sīphărum*, v. *supparum*'; '*suppărum*, i, n. et *supparus*, i, m. . . . scribitur autem et *sifarus* et *siparum* et *siparus* et *sipharum*'. Georges[1]: '*sīpărum*, *sīphărum* (*sīphărus*), s. *supparum*'; '*suppărum* (*sŭpărum* u. *sŭphărum*), i, n., u. *suppărus* (*sŭphărus*), i, m. (*σίφαρος*)'. Lewis and Short: '*sŭpărum* or *-us*, i, v. *supparum*'; '*suppărum* (*sŭpărium*, *sŭpărum*, *sŭphărum*), i, n. and *suppărus* (*sŭphărus*), i, m.' This then is one word, rejoicing in no fewer than eleven forms (most of which I have never met anywhere outside a dictionary[2]): *supparum*, *supparus*, *sīparum*, *sŭparum*, *sīpharum*, *sŭpharum*, *siparus*, *sifarus*, *sīpharus*, *sŭpharus*, *sŭparium*. And to this one word the lexicographers assign two meanings: (1) a topsail (or in military use a sort of banner), (2) a linen garment mostly worn by women. Similar opinions are forthcoming from all quarters: Studniczka *Beitr. z. Gesch. d. altgr. Tracht* p. 90 '*supparus* . . . bezeichnet ein linnenes Obergewand der Männer und Frauen, zugleich aber ein Art Segel und segeltüchtige Vorhänge, wie sie im Theater und anderwärts verwendet wurden'; Vaniček *Fremdwörter* p. 79 '*supparus* m., *supparum* n., ursprünglicher Name eines Segels . . . dann ein Frauengewand' (a description taken word for word from Hehn *Kulturpfl. u. Hausth.* p. 154 ed. 2); Pauli in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift* XVIII p. 5 '*supparus*, *supparum*, leinenes gewand, frauenhemde, toppsegel'; Weise *Griech. Wört. im Lat.* p. 181 'nächst der Tunika und Stola ist das am frühesten in der Litteratur auftretende Frauengewand das *supparum*. Sein Name (=*σίφαρον*) ist ein uraltes Lehnwort des Seewesens und bezeichnet ursprünglich ein linnenes Segel'; Marquardt *Privatl.* pp. 484 sqq. ed. 2 'das linnene Frauenkleid, welches zuerst in Mode kam, war das *supparum*. Das Wort ist . . . identisch mit *siparum* oder *σίφαρος* (das Segel)'; Lindsay *Lat. Lang.* p. 29 '*supparum*, with byform *siparum*'; Walde *Lat. etym. Wörterb.* '*supparum*, Toppsegel, Bramsegel, auch *siparum*, *sipharum*, aus gr. *σίπαρος*, *σίφαρος* entlehnt'; Keller *Lat. Volksetym.* p. 106 'das Toppsegel heisst lateinisch *supparum* und *supparus*, griechisch *σίφαρος*, *σίπαρος*.'

Facts tell another tale. These are two words, distinct both in form and in significance, and one of them makes its appearance more than two centuries

[1] Georges' article on *supparum* is reproduced, false quantities and all, in Saalfeld's *tensaurus Italograecus*.

[2] Not even Greek is copious enough for our etymologers, who enrich it with the forms *σίπαρος* and *σίφαρον*: Schuchardt *Vokal. d. Vulgärlat.* II p. 228, Ernout *Élem. dial. Lat.* p. 234, Keller *Lat. Volksetym.* pp. 106, 168, 175, Saalfeld *Italograeca* II p. 26, Weise *Griech. Wört. im. Lat.* pp. 69, 181, 293, 517, Walde *Lat. etym. Wörterb.* s. u. *supparum*.

earlier than the other. The word for a topsail is *sīpărum* or *sīphărum*: although its Greek name is σίφαρος in Arr. Epict. III 2 18 βυθιζομένου δὲ τοῦ πλοίου σύ μοι παρελθὼν ἐπαίρεις τοὺς σιφάρους and presumably also in Hesych. ἐπίδρομον . . . τὸ ἱστίον τὸ ἐν τῇ πρύμνῃ κρεμάμενον, ὃ καλοῦσι σίφαρον καὶ ἔλασσον (if this conjecture of Casaubon's for φᾶρον is true), its Latin name is neuter; for *sifarus* in *not. Tiron.* IV 4, tab. 109 88 ed. Schmitz., has no more right to count as Latin than *primna* or *bieris* on the same page. The word for the garment is *supparus*, masculine, which possesses, like *carbasus* and *sibilus*, a poetical neuter plural, *suppara*. For a neuter singular *supparum*[1] I can find no evidence but unsupported statements of the stupid and ignorant Nonius, the not very learned or intelligent Priscian, and certain scholiasts at Luc. II 364: Non. p. 540 '*supparum* est linteum femorale usque ad talos pendens, dictum quod subtus appareat', Prisc. G.L.K. II p. 169 '*supparus* περιώμιον et hoc *supparum*', schol. Luc. '*supparum* genus est indumenti', ' hoc *supparum* et haec suppara', '*supparum* est uestamentum puellare lineum' etc. (borrowed and corrupted from Paul. Fest. p. 311 *supparus*). Priscian and the scholiasts cite no example; Nonius is less discreet and cites four, one of which is visibly masculine, while the others, of which none is perceptibly neuter, include a verse cited by Festus as an example of *supparus*. It is however quite likely that in the decline of Latin, earlier than Nonius, a neuter singular was fabricated by false inference from the neuter plural, as *sibilum* was from *sibila* and *carbasum* from *carbasa*. The upstart has prospered amazingly: not only has it ousted both *supparus* and *siparum* from their place in the modern lexicons, but it has thence redounded upon the ancient, and in filling the gap at Fest. p. 340[a] 20-2 it is thrice introduced by Mueller and Lindsay, once for *supparus* and twice for *siparum*.

The facts of which I speak are the following texts. Wherever the MSS have any variant worth mentioning, I mention it; but in every such case the balance of their authority is in favour of the form which I adopt.

siparum or *sipharum*.

Sen. *ep.* 77 1 'omnis in pilis Puteolorum turba constitit et ex ipso genere uelorum Alexandrinas quamuis in magna turba nauium intellegit . solis enim licet *siparum* intendere, quod in alto omnes habent naues' . . . 2 'ceterae uelo iubentur esse contentae: *siparum* Alexandrinarum insigne est' . *siparum* utrobique VP b, *supparum* V ex corr.

Sen. *Med.* 327 sq. 'alto rubicunda tremunt | *sipara* uelo'. *sipara* E, *suppara* A.

Sen. *H.O.* 698 sq. 'rates quaerit in alto | quarum feriunt *sipara* nubes'. *sipara* E, *suppara* A.

Luc. V 427-9 'flexo nauita cornu | obliquat laeuo pede carbasa, summaque pandens | *sipara* uelorum perituras colligit auras'. *sipara* MZPC, Isid. *orig.*

[1] The lateness of this form is recognised, though not to the full, by Studniczka l.c.

XIX 3 4, *supara* U, *suppara* VG and all editors, '*sippera* uela sunt minora, unde et pantomimorum uela sic dicuntur, "siphario c. a. u." (Iuu. VIII 186)' schol. Bern.

Stat. *silu.* III 2 27 'uos summis adnectite *sipara* uelis'.

Auien. *Arat.* 760 sq. 'cum portum tenuere, auidi uolitantia raptim | *sipara* conuertunt'.

Isid. *orig.* XIX 3 2 'genera uelorum: acation, epidromos, dolo, artemo, *siparum*, mendicum.' . . . 4 '*siparum*[1] genus ueli unum pedem habens, quo iuuari nauigia solent in nauigatione quotiens uis uenti languescit. de quo Lucanus (V 429 above) "summaque tendens | *sipara* uelorum perituras colligit auras"; quod ex separatione existimant nominatum.'

Front. *ep. ad Anton.* I 2 p. 17 Nab. 'quod nunc uides prouenisse, et, quamquam non semper ex summis opibus ad eloquentiam uelificaris, tamen *sipharis* et remis tenuisse iter, atque, ut primum uela pandere necessitas impulit, omnis eloquentiae studiosos, ut lembos et celocas, facile praeteruehi'.

Tert. *apol.* 16 '*siphara* illa uexillorum et cantabrorum stolae crucum sunt'.

Tert. *ad nat.* I 12 'sic etiam in cantabris atque uexillis . . . *siphara* illa uestes crucum sunt'.

supparus.

Plaut. *Epid.* 232 '*supparum* (A and Non. p. 540, *subparum* P) aut subnimium, ricam, basilicum aut exoticum'.

Afran. *epistula* (Non. p. 540, Paul. Fest. p. 311, Ribb. *frag. com.* 122 sq.) 'tace: | puella non sum, *supparo* si induta sum?'

Nou. *paedio* (Non. p. 540, Ribb. *frag. com.* 70) '*supparum* purum belliensem (Veliensem coni. Lipsius) interim, escam meram.'

Varr. *Eumenidibus* (Non. pp. 540 and 549, Buech. *sat. Menipp.* 121) 'aurorat ostrinum hic indutus *supparum*.

Varr. *l. L.* V 131 'indutui alterum quod subtus, a quo subucula; alterum quod supra, a quo *supparus*.'

Paul. Fest. p. 311 4 '*supparus* uestimentum puellare lineum, quod et subucula, id est camisia, dicitur'.

Fest. p. 310[a] 10-23 (I do not try to show the dimensions of the gaps) '*supparus* <puellare dicebatu>r uestimen<tum lineum quod et s>ubucula ap<pellabatur. Titinius i>n fullonia . . . omne quod . . . <*sup*>*parum* puni . . . cat Naeuius de <bello Puni>co. et in nautis . . . <u>estem consec . . . nunc *supparos* . . . na iam crucem . . . detur puella . . . <Afra>nius ait "puella < non sum, supparo si in>duta sum?".'

Tert. *pall.* 4 'stolam et *supparum*'.

C.G.L. V p. 623 27 'subucula uel *supparis* (read *supparus*) est camisia'.

Luc. II 363 sq. 'umerisque haerentia primis | *suppara* nudatos cingunt

[1] Mr Lindsay has *siparum* in his text but *supparum* in his index, or rather Otto's index, which he has taken over without adapting it duly to his own recension or eliminating its misprints and other errors.

angusta lacertos'. schol. Bern. '*subpara* pro amiculis. *suppara* genus uestis quod alii stolam dicunt, alii thoracem uel amiculi genus'.

Arnob. *nat.* II 19 'subuculas, *suppara*, laenas'.

Apoll. Sid. *carm.* II 326 'pendula gemmiferae mordebant *suppara* bullae'.

C.G.L. IV p. 180 1 '*suppara* . . . tunicae quae et subuculae dicuntur'.

The confusion between *sipara* and *suppara*, which has ended in confounding *siparum* with *supparus*, perhaps began in the fifth century, the earliest date which can well be assigned to a poem exhibiting such prosody as *măluit*, *nēque*, *mentēque*, *Thersitĕs*, *Deidamiam* –⏑⏑–, and such grammar as *comes esse placet*. The 'uerba Achillis in parthenone' (anth. Lat. Ries. 198, P.L.M. Baehr. IV pp. 322 sqq.) contain the verse, 23, 'arma tegant nostrum potius quam *sipara* corpus'.

A. E. Housman.

EURIPIDES, *RHESVS* 720.

ὄλοιτ' ὄλοιτο πανδίκως
πρὶν ἐπὶ γᾶν Φρυγῶν ποδὸς ἴχνος βαλεῖν.

It is plainly absurd to wish that Odysseus, who has been on Phrygian soil these ten years, should perish in the future before he even treads upon it. Paley gets some sense by supplying 'as a conqueror or permanent settler,' but obviously we have no right to supply all that: nor indeed would any Greek poet have ever said such a thing as *ἐπὶ γᾶν ἴχνος βαλεῖν ὡς νικῶν* or *εἰσαεί*. See also Mr. Porter's note in *C.Q.* XI. 160. My explanation may be hazardous, but such as it is it would be somewhat as follows:

In the first place, it is notorious that in early Greek poetry the optative, present and aorist, is used in constructions which in strict Attic require imperfect or aorist indicative. I need say nothing of *ἔνθα κεν αὖτ' ἀπόλοιτο* and the like. But consider optatives after *εἰ*. Not only does Homer use *εἰ* with present optative instead of indicative, e.g. B 780 *ὡς εἴ τε νέμοιτο*, Λ 467 *ὡς εἴ ἑ βιῴατο*, X 411 *ὡς εἰ σμύχοιτο*, Ψ 274 *εἰ νῦν ἀεθλεύοιμεν*, but he even does at least once so use aorist optative for indicative, a fact which I have not seen noticed, *κ* 416 *ὡς εἰ ἱκοίατο*, 'as if they *had* come.' At N 343 *ὅς* is substituted for *εἰ* in the sentence *μάλα κε θρασυκάρδιος εἴη ὅς τότε γηθήσειεν* = *ἦν ἂν ὅς ἐγήθησεν*. And the important point for my purpose is that this use of *εἰ* with present optative is occasionally found in Attic, as everybody knows.

But we also find *εἰ*, etc., with optatives in wishes where Attic requires the indicative. Nestor's formula *εἴθ' ὣς ἠβώοιμι βίη τε μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη* means *εἴθ' ἤβων βία τε ἦν*. So *εἴην* at Π 722, *εἶεν* at Φ 429. And the aorist also can be used in wishes: N 825,

αἰ γὰρ ἐγὼν οὕτω γε Διὸς πάις αἰγιόχοιο
εἴην ἤματα πάντα, τέκοι δέ με πότνια Ἥρη.

Here indeed Goodwin's palliative, that *τέκοι* = *μήτηρ εἴη*, has some force; but explain it as you will, the fact remains that the aorist is used for a wish in past time. And at *σ* 79, *νῦν μὲν μήτ' εἴης, βουγάιε, μήτε γένοιο*, it seems to me that it would be rather disingenuous to profess that *γένοιο* does not refer to the past. It is not really a wish at all; the Homeric optative is much too elastic to be tied down tight,[1] and the tone is rather 'you had better never have been born.' So e.g. in *π* 102 *τάμοι* means 'might cut off if he liked,' not 'may be cut!' At *λ* 613 I think the force of *μηδ' ἄλλο τι τεχνήσαιτο* is something like 'he needed not to make' or 'should not have made anything else' (cf. Hayman's note); in any case that aorist seems to me to refer to the past like *τέκοι* and *γένοιο*, and if the older Homer only uses such aorists

[1] See Goodwin's appendix on this subject in *MT*².

after leading up to them with the milder *εἴην* or *εἴης*, the answer to that objection may be that we do not know that the author of the 'second *νέκυια*' may not have been prepared to go one better than his predecessors.

It is want of allowing sufficient freedom to optatives, I think, that has prevented people from seeing the real meaning of *γένοι' οἷος ἐσσὶ* at Pindar, *Pyth.* II. 72, which I take to be this: 'you (i.e. anybody) had better become what you are by nature; mere learning is no good,' *nascitur non fit:* the punctuation is Bergk's, and as it is accepted by Headlam and rejected by Schröder there can be little doubt of its correctness.

Again, *τί κεν ῥέξαιμι* at T 90 means 'what was I to do?' perhaps literally 'what could I have done?' but I doubt this, for at Γ 52 *οὐκ ἂν δὴ μείνειας*, 'you were not going to withstand,' cannot be so explained; anyhow parallels are easy to find, e.g. Hdt. II. 11, *κοῦ γε δὴ οὐκ ἂν χωσθείη*; 57, *τέῳ τρόπῳ ἂν φθέγξαιτο*; Ap. Rh. III. 267. Herodotus twice so uses the present optative, II. 45, *κῶς ἂν θύοιεν*, V. 106, *τί ἂν ποιέοιμι;* 'what could I be doing?' Some of these *can* be explained otherwise, but if we take a general view of the whole question it seems only reasonable to class them all together. But again the important point is that this usage survives in Attic: Antipho, *Tetr.* Γ *β* 5, *πῶς ἂν ἐπιβουλεύσαιμι αὐτῷ, εἰ μὴ καὶ ἐπεβουλεύθην ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*; Aesch. *Ag.* 292, *καὶ τίς τόδ' ἐξίκοιτ' ἂν ἀγγέλων τάχος*; Xen. *Mem.* I. ii. 64, *πῶς ἂν ἔνοχος εἴη;*

If then certain Ionic uses of optatives are found now and again in Attic, and if Homer two or three times uses aorist optative in wishes, is it altogether impossible that *ὄλοιτο* in *Rhesus* 720 should stand for *εἴθ' ὤλετο*?

But I do not believe that the poet could have used *any* aorist optative in this way; there is a peculiarity about *ὄλοιτο* which helps it. *ὄλοιτο* is a curse, and so may be used with greater vagueness than an ordinary optative of wishing. When Oedipus cries *ὄλοιθ' ὅστις ἦν ὃς ἀγριάς πέδας ἄμμασ' ἐπιποδίας*, etc., he is not expressing a wish for the future; that would be utterly ridiculous. He simply means 'a curse upon him whoever he was'; and it is no use asking when the curse is to fall. I think this consideration helps us to see the meaning of *ὄλοιτο πρὶν βαλεῖν*. 'A curse upon him, ere ever he did set foot on our land,' sounds tolerably right; or, if it be hardly tolerable in expression, it gives at any rate a visible sense.

Taking then these two considerations together, I think I see how this puzzling phrase came to be employed. If anyone prefer to explain it by means of only one of the two, I have no objection, but my own fancy is that the poet was influenced by both.

I do not think that Euripides would have done this, but the author of *Rhesus* had perhaps a taste for epic archaism. At 863 he says:

> *δέδοικα δ' αὐτὸν καί τί μου θράσσει φρένας*
> *μὴ καὶ Δόλωνα συντυχὼν κατακτάνῃ.*

This use of aorist subjunctive after *μή* to express a fear for the past is pretty common in Homer; it is found nowhere else in tragedy.

ARTHUR PLATT.

NOTES ON THE *BIRDS* OF ARISTOPHANES.

11 οὐδ' ἂν μὰ Δία γ' ἐντεῦθεν Ἐξηκεστίδης.

THIS mincing oath 'by Zeus at least' could only be put with any propriety into the mouth of some such character as Cousin Slender in the *Merry Wives of Windsor*; as Sir Hugh Evans, the Welsh parson, says, 'he would be capacity of it.' This is the real basis of Porson's rule, 'Post iusiurandum, qualia sunt νὴ Δία, νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλω, et cetera huiusmodi, nunquam sequitur particula γε nisi alio uocabulo interposito.' He accordingly corrected *Thesmoph.* 225:

οὐ γὰρ μὰ τὴν Δήμητρά γ' ἐνταυθοῖ μενῶ.

Δήμητρ' ἔτ' with the further excellent, or rather decisive, warrant of *Wasps* 1442:

οὗτοι μὰ τὴν Δήμητρ' ἔτ' ἐνταυθοῖ μενεῖς. (Cf. *Clouds* 814.)

So here the meaning is plainly this: up to now Execestides might have been able to find his way home, which for him was anywhere, but from here it would be no longer possible even for such an accommodating gentleman to do so. The reading can hardly be other than

οὐδ' ἂν μὰ Δί' ἔτ' ἐντεῦθεν Ἐξηκεστίδης.

Strangely enough Porson himself seems to have suggested for no particular reason

οὐδὲ μὰ Δί' ἐντεῦθεν γ' ἂν Ἐξηκεστίδης,

which Reisig essayed to improve by restoring the displaced ἄν, οὐδ' ἂν μὰ Δ.

Even Fritzsche's freak ἐνγετεῦθεν has proved attractive to many editors, and in *Knights* 698 the namby-pamby μὰ τὴν Δήμητρά γ', εἰ μή σ' ἐκφάγω (Rav.) is apparently supposed to suit the character of Cleon by most scholars, not however by Hall and Geldart, who with more judgement read Δήμητρ', ἐὰν μή.

16 τὸν ἔποφ', ὃς ὄρνις ἐγένετ' ἐκ τῶν ὀρνέων·

Several extravagant emendations of the concluding words are current, ἐξ ἀνδρός ποτε and ἄνθρωπός ποτ' ὤν (Köchly), ἐκ τοῦ Τηρέως (A. Palmer). It seems hardly necessary to deviate so far from the tradition. I suggest a less violent remedy

ἐκτὸς ὀρνέων

'aloof from birds,' an outsider bird, such as the hoopoe of the play is afterwards described to be, cf. 71-9, 93-106, and 114 sqq. He is the Wandering

Jew of the bird-world, for he is the real old original Tereus of the legend. At first sight of him Euelpides needs assurance that he is a bird (102):

Τηρεὺς γὰρ εἶ σύ ; πότερον ὄρνις ἢ ταὼς ;

Clearly a bird of this description could not be in the bird-market, and this is just the reason why the two adventurers had to go and seek him in the wilds. He was not marketable.

63 οὕτω 'στι δεινὸν οὐδὲ κάλλιον λέγειν.

So the best MSS. R.V.M., but the line is seriously corrupt, admittedly so. Bentley ingeniously proposed οὗτος, τί δεῖ νῷ τοῦδε, κάλλιον λέγειν, making Peisthetaerus the speaker, '*Heus tu, melius est ut dicas quid nos eum velimus.*' This certainly will not do; but suppose we adopt Bentley's suggestion in part, restoring the speech to Euelpides and giving it a very different but more appropriate meaning:

οὗτος, σέ τι δεῖ νῷ τοῦδε κάλλιον λέγειν.

He addresses the bird and says:

'What ho! there, you must find a better name for us than that.'

Of course νῷν is also possible, 'say to us,' etc.

161 ὑμεῖς μὲν ἆρα ζῆτε νυμφίων βίον.

This should probably be read as a question. So also 1530 (Meineke, Hall, and Geldart). In 1688 I suggest ἐς καιρὸν ἄρα καὶ κατεκόπησαν. Καί 'really' (cf. Soph. *El.* 385) might easily be lost before κατά.

168 τίς ὄρνις οὗτος ; ὁ Τελέας ἐρεῖ ταδί·

This line is open to considerable doubt. Hermann rejected ὄρνις not without reason. It ruins both the sense and the metre. Again, why is Teleas introduced as the denouncer of flighty people? It has been suggested as a possibility that, though the worst offender himself, he is hypocritically condemning his own follies: but as τένθης (*Peace* 1008) he would probably be too aldermanic for a flutterer. Now Peisthetaerus is serious in this matter, as Euelpides recognizes and even becomes serious himself (170):

νὴ τὸν Διόνυσον εὖ γε μωμᾷ ταυταγί.

The condemnation should be popular, universal, should proceed from 'the man in the street.' Accordingly I propose to eliminate Teleas altogether as an intruder and to read the line thus:

'τίς οὗτος ἔσθ' ;' ὁ <δὲ> γελάσας ἐρεῖ ταδί·

If you ask anyone (sc. τινά, τὸν ἐπιτυχόντα) as to the flutterers, 'What is this creature?' he with a smile will say this: 'It's a human bird,' etc. (ἄνθρωπος not ἄνθρωπος being the reading).

178 *ἀπολαύσομαί τί γ', εἰ διαστραφήσομαι.*

Many editors read *τι δ'*, giving a curious, if not impossible, position to *δέ* not justified by *Knights* 175, nor can much be said in favour of *γε*. My suggestion is that this last is a survival of *μέγα*, the first syllable having been lost through a lipography of *-μαι με*. 'I shall gain a lot, if I,' etc.

180 ΕΠ. *πόλος; τίνα τρόπον;* Π. *ὥσπερ εἴποι τις τόπος.*

This is the reading of the MSS. The words are meaningless. Dobree inserted *ἄν* before *εἴποι* to make them Greek. He also suggested an alternative *εἴ γ' εἴποις τόπος* with the same object. Most editors adopt *ὥσπερ εἰ λέγοις* from 282. Brunck has *ὥς τις εἰ λέγοι.*

The real weakness is in *τόπος*, which has no bearing whatever on the question Peisthetaerus is answering or pretending to answer. I take it he said *τρόπος* repeating the *τίνα τρόπον*; of the hoopoe, not in its simple sense but with irresistible quasi-scientific pomposity. Accordingly I would restore:

ὥσπερ εἰκός, εἷς τρόπος.

'As is probable, the *τρόπος* (that is, the movement or turning of the *πόλος*) is uniform.'

The graphical changes involved are not serious, so slight indeed that no discussion seems necessary, even if space would permit.

244 sqq. These lines contain the call to the marsh-birds. Other classes of birds have already been summoned: (1) the field-birds from the farm-lands, whose notes are generalized into *τιὸ τιὸ τιὸ τιό*, etc.; (2) the birds from the garden and the hill-side, who sing *τριοτὸ τριοτὸ τοτοβρίξ*. Afterwards the sea-birds are called. They are not singing birds, but the marsh-birds, as everyone knows are vocal, and yet their call ends with no imitation of their notes as might be expected, but with an appeal to a particular species *ἀτταγᾶς*, the francolin, or, as some say, the woodcock or the godwit. The probability is that neither the *ἀτταγᾶς* nor any other single species could ever have been named here. The word seems to be a corruption, and it may be quite a slight one, of the combined notes of the marsh-birds. If so, the passage should read (*ὅσα* in 245 for *οἵ* is merely a cover for *ἀτταγᾶς*):

οἵ θ' ἑλείας παρ' αὐλῶνας ὀξυστόμους
ἐμπίδας κάπτεθ', οἵ τ' εὐδρόσους γῆς τόπους
ἔχετε λειμῶνά τ' ἐρόεντα Μαραθῶνος ὄρ-
νεις πτερυγοποίκιλοι.
*** ***

268 The MSS. read unmetrically *ὦγάθ' ἀλλ' οὑτοσί*. Many suggestions have been made to remedy the defect. *Ἀλλ' οὖν* and *ἀλλά γ'* are the most

popular. Others are *ἄλλος, ἀλλ' εἷς* and *ἀλλὰ χοὐτοσί*. I venture to offer another:

ὦγαθ', ἀλλ' οὐχ οὑτοσὶ καὶ δή τις ὄρνις ἔρχεται ;

'But, my good man, is not that a bird coming this minute?' The reply is, *νὴ Δί' ὄρνις δῆτα*, 'Yes, by Zeus, so it is a bird.'

275 *νὴ Δί' ἕτερος δῆτα χοὗτος ἔξεδρον χώραν ἔχων.*

The usual explanation of *ἔξεδρον* 'foreign' 'outlandish' and so 'not native,' *οὐ τῶν ἠθάδων* (271) is pointless here. If this were the meaning of the adjective, *χρόαν*, which Hall and Geldart adopt from Suidas and a scholium, might well be preferred to *χώραν*.

The tradition, however, of all the MSS., confirmed by the statement that the phrase is a humorous borrowing from the Tyro of Sophocles, need not be changed. By *ἔξεδρον χώραν ἔχων* Aristophanes merely meant to say what is perfectly true and characteristic of the cock 'perching aloof from the other birds,' lit. 'holding an aloof-perch position.' *Ἔξεδρος* is used exactly as in Eurip. *Hipp.* 935 (cf. *Iphig. in T.* 80):

λόγοι παραλλάσσοντες ἔξεδροι φρονῶν,

'words aloof from sense or intelligence.' To give the phrase the same augural meaning as in the passage of Sophocles it travesties would be fatal to the jest.

494 *ἐς δεκάτην γάρ ποτε παιδαρίου κληθεὶς ὑπέπινον ἐν ἄστει,*
κἄρτι καθεῦδον, καὶ πρὶν δειπνεῖν τοὺς ἄλλους οὗτος ἄρ' ᾔσεν ·

Here a plain tale has been thrown into confusion, as witness the commentaries, by what is after all a slight corruption. If the first letter of *ἀνειπεῖν* were read as δ, an easy possibility in uncials, ΔΝΕΙΠΕΙΝ, nothing but the *δειπνεῖν* of the tradition could well be expected from the phenomenon. The meaning is 'and before the others proclaimed the dawn, this fellow crew.' This eccentricity on the part of some misguided bird long before the dawn is not at all unusual. Euelpides unfolds a straightforward tale. There is nothing about drinking secretly before dinner, as would appear from the received text. He went as an invited guest to a christening, as we say. He took part in the festivities: had a little of something to drink—this is the invariable account still given to the magistrate on the following morning—and then (*κᾆτα* not *κἄρτι*) went to sleep. He was wakened by the premature crowing (*νύκτωρ*) of this bird, and the rest followed accordingly.

537 *τοῦτο καθ' ὑμῶν*
αὐτῶν ὥσπερ κενεβρείων.

Read *αὖτως*, cf. Soph. *Trach.* 1040 *πεσοῦσαν αὖτως, ὧδ' αὖτως, ὥς μ' ὤλεσεν.*

546 *ἀναθεὶς γὰρ ἐγώ σοι*
τὰ νεοττία κἀμαυτὸν οἰκήσω.

Οἰκήσω is almost to a certainty a lipography of *οὐκ ὀκνήσω*. This Blaydes discerned before me, but he proceeded to suggest most needlessly *ἀναθεῖν' ἄρ'* for *ἀναθεὶς γάρ*, completely spoiling the bold declaration of the *Chorus*, that they 'will not quail,' cf. 628:

οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἂν ἐγώ ποθ' ἑκὼν τῆς σῆς γνώμης ἔτ' ἀφείμην.

also

638 *ἀλλ' ὅσα μὲν δεῖ ῥώμῃ πράττειν, ἐπὶ ταῦτα τεταξόμεθ' ἡμεῖς·*

555 *μηδ' εὐθὺς γνωσιμαχήσῃ.*

This is exactly the 'look at the war-map' so persistently recommended by a recent German Chancellor. Zeus must 'recognize the military situation.' There is no question of change of opinion, as some say, any more than there is in *Hdt.* VII. 130: *ταῦτ' ἄρα πρὸ πολλοῦ ἐφυλάξαντο γνωσιμαχέοντες καὶ τἆλλα καὶ ὅτι χώρην ἄρα εἶχον εὐαίρετόν τε καὶ ταχυάλωτον.*

566 *ἦν δὲ Ποσειδῶνί τις οἶν θύῃ, νήττῃ πυροὺς καθαγίζειν·*

Instead of *πυρούς* (*v.* 565) I would suggest *πύελον*, 'to dedicate a bathing-tub to the duck,' an appropriate offering for a water-bird whose name means 'swimmer.' Cf. *Knights* 1060, *Peace* 843.

600 *τῶν ἀργυρίων· οὗτοι γὰρ ἴσασι· λέγουσι δέ τοι τάδε πάντες.*

Many corrections of *λέγουσι* to help the rhythm here have been attempted, *ᾄδουσι* (Elmsley), *ὑμνοῦσι* (Reisig), etc. With even less straining of the tradition we might read:

οὗτοι γὰρ ἴσασ'· ἀλέγουσι δὲ τοιάδε πάντες·

'for they all pay regard to such matters.' Cf. Pind. *Isth.* VIII. 103 *φαντὶ γὰρ συναλέγειν καὶ γάμον Θέτιος ἄνακτα.*

660 *κατάλειφ' ἡμῖν δεῦρ' ἐκβιβάσας, ἵνα παίσωμεν μετ' ἐκείνης.*

Instead of the rather inane *ἵνα παίσωμεν* I suggest that Aristophanes probably wrote *ἀναπαίσωμεν*, 'let us deliver the Parabasis.' This is just what they proceed to do, as soon as the actors quit the stage, cf. 681-3, and the Parabasis is in some respects, if not absolutely, the most important part of an Aristophanic comedy.

753 *εἰ μετ' ὀρνίθων τις ὑμῶν, ὦ θεαταί, βούλεται*
διαπλέκειν ζῶν ἡδέως τὸ λοιπόν, ὡς ἡμᾶς ἴτω.

It is obvious that *διαπλέκειν* (*τὸν βίον*) and *ζῆν τὸ λοιπόν* mean just the same thing. The whole point of the epirrhema (753-67) is that discredited

knaves and rascals are whitewashed in bird-land. They are to be honoured not held in disgrace. Accordingly I would read:

διαπρέπειν,

'to be men of mark,' 'personages of distinction.' They are not to be mere nobodies. Their peccadillos are to be almost patents of nobility, a really fine prospect. Ἐκπερδικίσαι (768) 'to go over to Perdikkas,' 'to side with the Kaiser.'

807. This seems a confidential communication to the audience, and might be better punctuated thus:

ταυτὶ μὲν ἡμᾶσμεσθα· κατὰ τὸν Αἰσχύλον
τάδ' οὐχ ὑπ' ἄλλων ἀλλὰ τοῖς αὐτῶν πτεροῖς.

'These are the comparisons made of us. As Aeschylus says, "These shafts are winged with feathers all our own."'

812 φέρ' ἴδω, τί δ' ἡμῖν ὄνομ' ἔσται τῇ πόλει;

Bentley's τοὔνομα is usually accepted, but the traditional ὄνομα may be right:

φέρ' ἴδω, τί δῆθ' ἡμῖν ὄνομ' ἔσται τῇ πόλει; (Cf. 817.)

823 τά τ' Αἰσχίνου γ' ἅπαντα; Π. καὶ λῷστον μὲν οὖν
τὸ Φλέγρας πεδίον.

Perhaps instead of καὶ λῷστον we might read κᾆν ᾧ 'στιν, i.e. τόπῳ. Even if this be the best joke of the three, the poet would hardly be likely so say so.

841 φύλακας κατάστησαι, τὸ πῦρ ἔγκρυπτ' ἀεί.

This last direction can scarcely be considered humorous. Perhaps ἐπίτυφ', 'kindle,' may be nearer the mark, cf. 1161. It is clear enough the watch-fires are to be lit.

850 παῖ παῖ. Possibly παπαῖ or βαβαῖ.

1081 τοῖς τε κοψίχοισιν ἐς τὰς ῥῖνας ἐγχεῖ τὰ πτερά.

There is just one letter wrong in the verb here. Read ἐγχοῖ (ἐν and χόω=χώννυμι), 'crams in.' Feathers could not be 'poured' into the nostrils of blackbirds.

1146 ἐς τὰς λεκάνας ἐνέβαλλον αὐτοῖς τοῖν ποδοῖν,

Probably αὖτως, 'just so.' There is no real need for αὐτοῖς here.

1190 πρὸς ἐμὲ καὶ θεούς. ἀλλὰ φύλαττε πᾶς.

Read ἄγε for ἀλλά. The corresponding antistrophic line is 1264:

μηκέτι τὴν ἐμὴν διαπεραῖν πόλιν. . . .

1221 *ἀδικεῖς δὲ καὶ νῦν. ἆρά γ' οἶσθα τοῦθ' ὅτι.*

Perhaps we should read *ἀδικεῖς δὲ καινόν*, 'but your crime is a new one.' The offence being absolutely new explains on the one hand why the question in 1219 cannot be answered, and on the other makes it necessary to impress upon Iris the serious nature of the new crime which, she is told, deserves capital punishment.

There is a pointed humour in this, but little, if any, in *ἀδικεῖς δὲ καὶ νῦν.*

1273 *ὦ τρισμακάρι', ὦ κατακέλευσον.* ΠΕ. *τί σὺ λέγεις ;*

The idea that *κατακέλευσον* is an appeal of the herald either 'bid me stop' (my compliments), or 'signal me to begin' (my message), seems to me exceedingly unlikely; nor is Dindorf's 'suggest a few more epithets' any better.

Might we not read the line thus:

ὦ τρισμακάρι'. ΠΕ. *ὦ κατακέλευσον. τί σὺ λέγεις ;*

'O thrice-blessed, . . . ΠΕ. O ring off! What have you to tell?'

Κατακέλευσον would literally mean 'order that down,' cf. *καταβοάω*, etc.

1376 *ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ σώματί τε νέαν ἐφέπων. . . .*

I venture to suggest a line curiously near the tradition (which adds a very doubtful *σώματι* to *φρενί*):

ἀφόβῳ φρενὶ σῶμ' ἀτιτάνιον ἐφέπων.

This he might well have said: 'Driving an untitanic body with a fearless soul.' He is flying up to Olympus (*ἀναπέτομαι δὴ πρὸς Ὄλυμπον*) as bold, though not as big, as a Titan.

1441 *τοῖς μειρακίοις ἐν τοῖσι κουρείοις ταδί ;*

There is serious objection to *μειρακίοις* here. Boys would not be very likely to sympathize with the speakers. They might even admire the offenders. In fact, remarks of this kind could only be made by an elderly man to elderly men. I suggest as probable and certainly more appropriate:

τοῖς ἡλίκοις, :

'to those as old' (*sc.* as themselves), cf. *Acharn.* 702. It is at least doubtful whether boys would be tolerated at all by their gossiping fathers in barbers' shops.

1501 ΠΕ. *οἴμ', ὡς βδελύττομαί σε.* ΠΡ. *τί γὰρ ὁ Ζεὺς ποιεῖ ;*
ἀπαιθριάζει τὰς νεφέλας ἢ ξυννέφει ;
ΠΕ. *οἴμωζε μεγάλ'.* ΠΡ. *οὕτω μὲν ἐκκαλύψομαι.*

The last reply of Prometheus is not really so inconsequent as it appears. There is a jest here, and it is of the kind exemplified by *Ecclesiaz.* 404 (*Class.*

Quart., January, 1919, p. 14). The assumption is (cf. 1501) that Peisthetaerus said with exactly the same sound as οἴμωζε μεγάλα :

οἴμ', ὡς δὲ μεγάλα (*sc.* νέφη).

'O my! and what big ones!' This reassures Prometheus, and he declares at once, 'If that is the case, I'll uncover.'

1562 κᾆτ' ἀνῆλθ' αὐτῷ κάτωθεν
πρὸς τὸ λαῖμα τῆς καμήλου
Χαιρεφῶν ἡ νυκτερίς.

Most editors read τὸ λαῖγμα after Bentley (= θῦμα Hesych.). B. B. Rogers adopts a suggestion of W. C. Green's, πρὸς τό γ' αἷμα, but the position of γε is unlikely. We should probably read :

πρὸς στάλαγμα τῆς καμήλου,

'to the blood-drip of the camel,' cf. Soph. *Antig.* 1239. The corruption would begin with the omission of the second sigma.

1608 νῦν μὲν ὑπὸ ταῖς νεφέλαισιν ἐγκεκρυμμένοι
κύψαντες ἐπιορκοῦσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ βροτοί·

I take exception to κύψαντες here. The explanation, 'inclinantes sese' (Hemsterhuis), is not at all appropriate to describe the behaviour of a man taking a false oath. He would, in fact, betray himself at once by this attitude. However, unless I mistake, the true reading is only slightly different from the tradition :

ὕψ' ὄντας (cf. Ζεὺς δ' ἥμενος ὕψι, *Il.* XX. 155).

Mortals do not scruple to use you for perjury, because (1) you are up aloft, and (2) they are screened from your sight by the clouds.

1615. I suggest that the Triballian's ναβαισατρεῦ is according to Poseidon something like ναί· 'πήνεσ'· εὖ, whereas he was really saying he was very hungry, ἐμὲ πεῖνα τρύ(ει). This is, of course, somewhat strained, but scarcely, if at all, more so than the current solutions which seem to need a little reconsideration.

T. L. Agar.

Manchester.

εἰ μὲν οὖν ἡμεῖς μὲν φύλακας ὡς ἀληθῶς ποιοῦμεν, ἥκιστα κακούργους τῆς πόλεως, ὁ δ' ἐκεῖνο λέγων γεωργούς τινας καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν πανηγύρει ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἑστιάτορας εὐδαίμονας, ἄλλο ἄν τι ἢ πόλιν λέγοι.

'MORE simply expressed,' write Jowett and Campbell, 'the sense is as follows: "If the idea of a state requires the citizens to be guardians, he who converts them into rustic holiday-workers will mean something that is not a state."' This rendering, which seems to be necessary if the traditional text is retained, is difficult to reconcile with the preceding argument. Although this note will suggest an emendation, its chief purpose is to indicate the connexion of this passage with the argument of which it is the closing sentence.

At the beginning of Book IV. an imaginary objector (*τις* 419a 2) urges that the guardians will not be happy under Socrates' scheme. Unlike other rulers, they have no lands or fine houses, or an equipment consonant with such houses (*πρέπουσαν κατασκευήν*);[1] they have no private sacrifices,[2] and do not entertain guests.[3] In short: they have neither silver nor gold, nor any of the things commonly associated (*πάντα ὅσα νομίζεται*) with those who are to be blissfully happy.

It is evident that the happiness here contemplated is in the grand style. As the footnotes indicate, each single characteristic is a mark of that virtue of the ruling class which the Greeks called *μεγαλοπρέπεια*. Since the guardians will have no money, it is evident that this dazzling tradition (*λαμπρότης*) of splendid living and noble spending cannot be continued. Socrates fully realizes that this loss is the objector's point. One does not, he says, expect the noblest part of a statue to be the most highly coloured; so, it is implied, the highest class in the state should not demand exceptional pleasures.[4] If his argument is to convince the imaginary objector whom Adeimantos puts forward, he must show that pleasures of this rare quality are incompatible with the guardian's work. Mere rustic jollity (such as *γεωργούς* implies) is no temptation to the *μεγαλοπρεπής*.

[1] Cf. *Nic. Eth.* I. 123a 6: *μεγαλοπρεποῦς δὲ καὶ οἶκον κατασκευάσασθαι πρεπόντως τῷ πλούτῳ (κόσμος γάρ τις καὶ οὗτος), καὶ περὶ ταῦτα μᾶλλον δαπανᾶν κ.τ.λ.*

[2] 362c *πλεονεκτοῦντα δὲ πλουτεῖν . . . καὶ θεοῖς θυσίας καὶ ἀναθήματα ἱκανῶς καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῶς θύειν κ.τ.λ.* In Aristotle, *Pol.* 1319b 25, the reduction of the number of *ἴδια ἱερά* is mentioned as one of the democratic reforms made in Athens by Kleisthenes and also in the city of Cyrene. Cf. *Laws* 909d-910. The great family of the Alcmaeonids sacrificed to the Carian Zeus (*Hdt.* V. 66), and the Gephyraei also had separate rites to the Achaean Demeter (*Hdt.* V. 61).

[3] *ξενοδοκοῦντες.* At the wooing of Agariste Kleisthenes *καὶ ἅμα ἐξείνιζε μεγαλοπρεπῶς* (*Hdt.* VI. 128). Cf. *Eth.* 1123a 3.

[4] Compare a similar figure in Aristotle, *Pol.* III. 13 (1284b 8).

Consequently Socrates imagines men of another class invested with the trappings of a great man or dining in state and attempting to carry on their work at the same time: *ἐπιστάμεθα γὰρ καὶ τοὺς γεωργοὺς ξυστίδας ἀμφιέσαντες καὶ χρυσὸν περιθέντες πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐργάζεσθαι κελεύειν τὴν γῆν, καὶ τοὺς κεραμέας κατακλίναντες ἐπὶ δεξιὰ πρός τὸ πῦρ διαπίνοντάς τε καὶ εὐωχουμένους τὸν τροχὸν παραθεμένους, ὅσον ἂν ἐπιθυμῶσι κεραμεύειν κ.τ.λ.* We may remember the young Pheidippides in the *Clouds*, whose Alcmaeonid mother crooned to him a song about the magnificent Megakles:

ὅταν σὺ μέγας ὢν ἅρμ' ἐλαύνῃς πρὸς πόλιν,
ὥσπερ Μεγακλῆς, ξυστίδ' ἔχων. 70

Naturally the lad despised his father's goats and goatskins at rocky Phelleus, and spent royally like a good Alcmaeonid. In the same way the farmers will neglect their task for the state that they are expected to maintain. It is an easy inference that rulers, with temptations no less *in kind and degree*, will confuse the essentials with the accidentals of power.

But that is not the conclusion drawn in the sentence at the head of this note. It seems to say that the rulers will be seduced by the pleasures of the vulgar. But the farmer was only mentioned above to illustrate the effect of living like a lord; the objector did not propose that the lord should enjoy himself like a farmer. The text cannot be defended by pointing out that the ruler should, on the objector's view, possess lands; for he will hold them as a *grand seigneur*. Nor is it relevant to quote that sentence in Book III. (417a) which suggests that guardians in pursuit of gain will become business men and farmers. That states rather the effect of *acquisition* (*κτήσονται*) on whatever scale upon men's *interests;* this deals with the *pleasure* of using large *possessions* (*κεκτημένοι*) in a large way. Has not *γεωργούς* crept into the text because the word is repeatedly used in the illustration? I do not think it is sufficient to say that Plato loftily refuses to distinguish between the two grades of pleasure when the distinction is the objector's point.

The presence of *γεωργούς* in the text colours the interpretation of *πανήγυρις* and *ἑστιάτορας*. But a *πανήγυρις* may be viewed from two sides. It is not only the opportunity for the vulgar to enjoy themselves (cf. Aristophanes, *Peace* 340); it is a national festival, provided by men of wealth and station or giving occasion for display appropriate to their station.[1] I suggest that Plato had in mind those public services or *λειτουργίαι* which are performed *τοῖς χρήμασι*, not *τῷ σώματι*,[2] or (as Aristotle put it) are *δαπανηραὶ μέν, μὴ χρησιμοὶ δέ, οἷον χορηγίαι κ.τ.λ.*[3] The expenditure could only be undertaken by wealthy men, and was an opportunity for display. Ordinarily *ἑστιάτωρ* is the giver of a state dinner, whether to the tribe or, as was done by the more magnificent, to the city (see note 4). As such feasts took place at the Dionysia or the

[1] For the Greek view cf. *Eud. Eth.* 1122a: *οἷον τὴν θεωρίαν οὐκ ᾤετο Θεμιστοκλεῖ πρέπειν, ἣν ἐποιήσατο Ὀλυμπίαζε, διὰ τὴν προϋπάρξασαν ταπεινότητα, ἀλλὰ Κίμωνι.*

[2] Lysias, *Or.* XIX. 58.

[3] *Pol.* 1309a 18.

Panathenaea,[1] the association of the word with *πανήγυρις* seems to make this a natural sense here. The greatest of the burdens assumed by the public-spirited was the *χορηγία*, a name which also covered all such 'useless' services. As we find *χορηγός* and *ἑστιάτωρ* linked together in Greek usage,[2] I suggest that the text should read ΧΟΡΗΓΟΥΣ *τινας καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν πανηγύρει ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν πόλει ἑστιάτορας εὐδαιμόνας*. Then the argument will meet the objection fairly; the atmosphere of this reply is the same as that of the criticism. Socrates distinguishes between the function of the ruler and the *φιλοτιμία* traditionally associated with his station.[3] He will have his rulers true guardians of the city: the objector, he contends, confuses office with the trappings of state. But while they may be appropriate in a *πανήγυρις*, they only make a seeming ruler, not a real one (cf. *ὄντες*) (*δοκοῦντες*, 421a).[4] If the virtue of *μεγαλοπρέπεια* is to be a characteristic of the guardians—and he insists that it shall be[5]—it must take a new direction. That direction is thus defined in 486a: *Ἡι οὖν ὑπάρχει διανοίᾳ μεγαλοπρέπεια καὶ θεωρία παντὸς μὲν χρόνου, πάσης δὲ οὐσίας, οἷόν τε τούτῳ μέγα τι δοκεῖν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον*; But the traditional splendour of the ruler will only sharpen the conflict between rich and poor (421c 8).

A. S. FERGUSON.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
KINGSTON, CANADA.

[1] Scholiast on Demosthenes, *Lept.* 21.

[2] Demosth. *Lept.* 21 *χορηγοὶ καὶ γυμνασίαρχοι καὶ ἑστιάτορες. . . . Or.* XXXIX. 7, XXI. 156; these were *σέμν' ἀναλώματα* (158). Cf. *Eth.* 1122b 22: *οἷον εἴ που χορηγεῖν οἴονται δεῖν λαμπρῶς ἢ τριηραρχεῖν ἢ καὶ ἑστιᾶν τὴν πόλιν.*

[3] For the connexion between *φιλοτιμία* and *λειτουργίαι* see e.g. *De Corona* 257, *Eth.* 1122b 22.

[4] Other emendations are *ἀργούς* (Richards) and *λεωργούς* (Adam). These words echo *κακούργους* in the preceding line. But I venture to doubt whether a repetition of the implied criticism is required. For the clause *ὁ δ' ἐκεῖνο λέγων . . .* appears merely to state the proper place of such rulers as the objector asks for—if they have a function, it is in the *πανήγυρις*.

Another possibility may be mentioned, although it is less probable. The city sent to Olympia and other great *πανηγύρεις* a *θεωρός* magnificently dressed, like the farmers in the illustration. While ΘΕΩΡΟΥΣ is possible, it seems to be less likely than *χορηγούς*, because the latter word was commonly associated with *ἑστιάτωρ*, and covered all such services, while the office of *θεωρός* was an exceptional duty performed outside the city. On the whole, as the cause of the misreading was psychological, it seems not improbable that a scribe with ΓΕΩΡΓΟΥΣ in his mind might read it into the ΧΟΡΗΓΟΥΣ of the manuscript. If Plato was carrying on the terms used in his illustration (which is conceivable), then it may be noted that the *χορηγός*, like the farmers, was splendidly attired.

[5] 487a, 494b, 536a.

A NINTH-CENTURY COMMENTARY ON PHOCAS.

One of the most learned and prolific writers of the ninth century was Remigius of Auxerre[1] (c. 841-908). In addition to lengthy expositions of several books of the Bible, he wrote Commentaries on Donatus, Priscian,[2] Eutyches,[3] Beda,[4] the *Disticha Catonis*,[5] Sedulius, Martianus Capella,[6] Boethius, and Phocas.

The Commentary on the *Ars de Nomine et Verbo* of Phocas[7] was extant in the twelfth century at Brogne and Anchin, and later at Peterborough and Ramsey.[8] Nothing, however, was known of it until Manitius claimed to have discovered a series of excerpts from it in a MS. at Rouen (No. 1470, saec. x./xi.) from which he printed a number of brief extracts.[9] A complete—or practically complete—copy of this Commentary exists in a MS. in the British Museum which was unknown to Manitius. The following account of this MS. will serve to give an idea of the work, and to show that Manitius was correct in regarding the glosses in the Rouen MS. as abridged and rearranged from the Commentary of Remigius:

MS. *Royal* 12. F. iv., vellum, 3 unnumbered and 202 numbered folios measuring 28 by 18 cms., single columns with 38 lines to the page. Titles in red, and initial letters frequently illuminated in green, blue, yellow, and red. The MS. proper (i.e. ff. 1-202) is written in a hand of the latter part of the twelfth century, and there are a few marginal notes in a hand of the same period. At the top of f. 1a is written in a modern hand, *Liber Iohannis Theyer*[10] *de Cowpers Hill iuxta Glouc.*, and from a note on f. 1b we learn that the MS. had previously belonged to Horsham Priory, co. Norfolk.

Of the three unnumbered folios bound in at the beginning of the MS., the recto of the first is blank, on its verso are a few scribbles in late hands; the second and third are a fragment of some twelfth-century service-book[11] with

[1] For general accounts see Hauréau, *Hist. de la Philos. Scolastique*, i., 1872, pp. 199-206; Huemer, *Wiener Sitzungsberichte*, 96, 1880, pp. 505-551; Manitius, *Gesch. lat. Lit. des Mittelalters*, i., 1911, pp. 504-519.

[2] Cf. Manitius, *Münchener Museum für Philol. des Mittelalters*, 2, 1913, pp. 79-98.

[3] Manitius, *ibid.*, pp. 101-108.

[4] Manitius, *ibid.*, pp. 98-101.

[5] Manitius, *ibid.*, pp. 109-113.

[6] Esposito, *Didaskaleion; Studi filologici di letteratura cristiana antica*, iii., 1914, pp. 173-181.

[7] Phocas is thought to have lived in the second half of the fifth century, cf. Teuffel, *Gesch. röm. Lit.*, 6e Aufl., iii., 1913, § 472, 4.

[8] Cf. Manitius, *Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde*, 32, pp. 681-683.

[9] *Neues Archiv*, 36, 1910, pp. 47-48; *Gesch. lat. Lit.*, i., 1911, p. 510; *Didaskaleion*, ii., 1913, pp. 73-88.

[10] Of Theyer's valuable collection of about 800 MSS. some 312 are now in the British Museum (cf. *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, art. Theyer, John). Theyer lived from 1597 to 1673.

[11] According to Mr. J. P. Gilson, who has kindly furnished me with some particulars about the MS., these fragments are from an antiphonal.

musical notation. The MS. proper contains, ff. 1a-18b, the Commentary of Remigius on Phocas; ff. 19a-197a [Isidori Hispalensis[1] Etymologiarum Libri]; ff. 197b-202a, written in double columns [Allegoriae Quaedam Scripturae Sacrae, auctore Isidoro]. The scribe has left this last work unfinished. It breaks off on f. 202a with the words, *a colonis apostolis* = Migne, *Patrol. Lat.*, 83, cols. 97-125. Then follow a few notes in a modern hand, and on f. 202b a few more scribbles.

We may now proceed to give some extracts from the Commentary of Remigius, which embraces nearly the whole text of Phocas.[2] In the MS. the comments are written in black, the words of Phocas being in red.[3]

f. 1a: Incipit Expositio Remigii Super Focam.

Ars mea multorum es, quos secula prisca tulerunt; Sed noua te breuitas asserit esse meam.[4]

Ars dicitur ab artis preceptis, id est a strictis regulis, eo quod uniuersa comprehendat.[5] Ars etiam est congregatio uel perceptio rerum et dicitur apo tis aretis, id est a uirtute.[6]

Iste Phocas in exordio libri sui prefaciunculam elegiaco carmine composuit. Elegiacum carmen est ubi primus uersus est exameter et sequens pentameter. Elegos grece, miseros latine. Inde elegiacum carmen dicitur eo quod miseris conuenit.[7] Sciendum autem est quod antiquissimus grammaticorum fuit iste Phocas adeo ut de illo Priscianus multa sumpsit exempla. Et fecit librum suum de duabus partibus, de substantiali et actuali, id est de nomine et uerbo, et alloquitur suum librum per apostropham figuram, id est per conuersionem.

Es, scilicet tu,[8] mea ars[9] inquit ars multorum. *Quos*, scilicet grammaticos.[10] *Tulerunt*, id est deportauerunt. *Prisca secula*, id est antiqua secula scilicet. *Asserit*, id est affirmat. *Noua breuitas te esse meam artem*, non enim te primus adinueni sed de aliorum libris te accepi.

Omnia cum ueterum sunt explorata libellis, Multa loqui breuiter sit nouitatis opus.[11]

Sit nouitatis opus, id est sit mihi nouum opus. *Multa loqui breuiter*, id est multa dicere breuiter. *Cum sint explorata*, id est inuestigata; *omnia* scilicet quę necessaria sunt ex libellis ueterum.

Te relegat iuuenis, quem garrula pagina terret, Aut si quem paucis seria nosse iuuat.[12]

O mi *te relegat*, id est iterum legat iuuenis; *quem terret*, id est horrescit; *garrula pagina*, id est uerbosa. *Aut si quem iuuat*, id est delectat; *nosse*, id

[1] This MS. is not referred to in Lindsay's edition of the *Etymologiae* (2 vols., Oxford, 1911).

[2] I.e. that portion on pp. 410-436, line 25, of Keil's edition (*Grammatici Latini*, v., 1868, pp. 410-439), only the last two and a half pages not being commented on.

[3] In the extracts above I print the words of Phocas in italics.

[4] Phocas, p. 410, 2-3.

[5] Cf. Isidori *Etymol.*, i., 1, 2 (ed. Lindsay).

[6] Isid., *ibid.*, i., 5, 2, Alii dicunt a Graecis hoc tractum esse uocabulum [ars] ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς, id est a virtute.

[7] Isid., *ibid.*, i., 39, 14.

[8] *tuo* cod.

[9] *as* cod.

[10] *gramaticos* cod.

[11] Ed., p. 410, 4-5.

[12] Ed., p. 410, 6-7.

est scire; *seria*, id est certas regulas nominum et uerborum; *paucis*, id est breuiter.

Te longinqua petens comitem sibi ferre uiator Ne dubitet, paruo pondere multa uehis.[1]

Ne dubitet uiator te ferre sibi *comitem*, id est socium; *longinqua petens*, id est longa pergens O mi liber; *uehis*, id est portas.

f. 18b (the work ends): *Ferio feris percussi.*[2] Ferio ostendit tertiam coniugationem et non habet preteritum. *Hoc*,[3] scilicet uerbum quod est edo. *Infinitiui*[4] *modi presentis temporis*[5] *non re*[6] *sillabam, sed in se contra morem omnium mittit.*[7] Ideo contra morem quia in re debuisset dicere. *Esse enim dicendum est: uolo uis uolui: hoc quoque*,[8] scilicet uerbum quod est uolo, *incerte est coniugationis et in futuro imperatiui et infinitiui*[9] *modi deficit et in gerundiuis*[10] *uel participialibus, que alii supina dicunt: meto messui facit*;[11] *nam aliter proferri non est.*[12] *Hec*,[13] scilicet uerba, *polleo*, id est cresco, *furio*, id est insanio, *sisto*[14] uel stare facio, *similiter et glisco*, id est opto uel cresco, *et quatio nullum habent preteritum.*[15] *Memineris*, id est recorderis, *etiam*[16] *incoatiue forme uerba in preterito perfecto deficere.*[17] Quare? Quia (*qua* cod.) incoactiua forma non potest habere preteritum. Finit Ars.

Manuscript copies of the *Ars* of Phocas are common,[18] and the work appears to have been fairly well known during the earlier Middle Ages.[19] There was extant at Glastonbury in 1247 a Commentary on it by a certain Cornutus,[20] but this work has disappeared, and with the exception of Remigius of Auxerre we know of no other commentator on the *Ars*.[21]

With regard to the other grammatical commentaries of Remigius, to the MSS. enumerated by Manitius[22] we can add the following:

(*a*) Commentary on Donatus, Basel, F. iii. 32; Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll., 385, pp. 345-358, saec. xiii., imperfect; London, British Museum, Burney 315, pp. 11-25, saec. xiv. (on the *Ars Minor*); Oxford, Bodleian, E Mus. 96, s. xiv. in. (*Ars Minor*); Worcester, Cathedral Library, Q°. 50, s. xiv.[23]

(*b*) Commentary on the *Disticha Catonis*, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll., 144, ff. 74-75, s. ix. ex., Tria sunt requirenda initio uniuscuiusque libri persona locus et tempus . . . hos breuitas fecit sensus coniungere binos.

(*c*) Commentary on Sedulius, Cambridge, Gonville and Caius Coll., 144,

[1] *Ed.*, p. 410, 8-9. For *uehis* Keil reads *uehens*. The reading *uehis* is given by the Munich and Wolfenbüttel MSS. collated by Keil, and our text agrees with these MSS. in several other readings.

[2] *Ed.*, p. 436, l. 18.

[3] *Ibid.*, 19.

[4] *infiniti* Keil.

[5] *praesens tempus* K.

[6] *in re* K.

[7] *Ibid.*, 19-20.

[8] *Ibid.*, 20-21.

[9] *infiniti* K.

[10] *gerundi* K.

[11] *messem feci* K.

[12] *potest* K.; *ibid.*, 21-23.

[13] *Hec* om. K.

[14] *sisto* om. cod.

[15] *Ibid.*, 23-24.

[16] *tamen* K.

[17] *Ibid.*, 24-25.

[18] Teuffel, *Gesch.*, iii.[6], § 472, 4.

[19] Manitius, *Gesch.*, i., pp. 46, 167, 279, 281, 460, 464, 492, 509.

[20] Manitius, *ibid.*, p. 509.

[21] Keil (*Gr. Lat.*, v., pp. 406-7) mentions two anonymous Commentaries on Phocas, Munich, 19454, pp. 145-236, s. xi., and Vatican, Regin. 1560, ff. 24-35, s. xi. The first seems identical with, and the second closely allied to, the work of Remigius described above.

[22] *Gesch.*, i., pp. 506-515.

[23] The Commentary on the *De Barbarismo* in Gotha, Membr. ii., No. 126, ff. 1a-24a, s. xii./xiii. (Jacobs, *Beiträge zur ältern Litteratur*, i., 1835, p. 228), is perhaps that of Remigius

ff. 1-74, s. ix. ex.; Cheltenham, Phillipps 25146, s. xi. (present locality doubtful); Durham, Cathedral Library, C. 4. 10, s. xii.; Edinburgh, Advocates' Library, 18. 5. 10, s. xi. in., f. 12b; Oxford, Bodleian, Junius 25, f. 182b, s. ix.; Salisbury, Cathedral Library, 134, ff. 1-53, s. xii. in., end missing.[1]

The eleventh-century catalogue of books belonging possibly to Worcester Priory (Bannister, *English Historical Review*, 32, 1917, p. 389) includes a *Commentum Remigii super Sedulium*, and *Remigii Commentaria super Sedulium* are found in the list of Bale's books (*Scriptorum Brytanniae Catalogus*, Pars ii., Basileae, 1559, p. 167).

(*d*) Commentary on Martianus Capella, Basel, F. v. 17, ff. 1b-38a, s. x. (first two books only); Brussels, 5092-94, ff. 1a-13a, s. xii. (first two books); Berlin, Lat. 179 (formerly Phillipps 1817), ff. 2a-28b, s. x. (first book only);[2] Cambridge, Trinity Coll., 27 (B. 1. 29), ff. 144a-177b, s. xii./xiii. (apparently only the first two books and perhaps not the work of Remigius); Glasgow, Hunterian Museum, 280, ff. 36, s. xii.; Leyden, Lat. 167, s. xii.,[3] and Perizonius xviii., 2, s. xiii. ex.; London, British Museum,[4] Reg. 15. A. xxxiii., ff. 4a-239a, s. ix./x.; Oxford, Bodleian, 20628 (Auct. T. 2. 19), ff. 1-166b, s. ix. ex., and Merton Coll., 291, s. xii. (probably the work of Remigius); Paris, Lat. 14754, saec. xii.; Rome, Vatican, Regin. 1970.

ADDENDUM.

Since the above was printed off [1917] I have noted the existence of several other MSS. of the Remigius commentaries:

(*a*) On Donatus, Admont 756, s. xiii.; Erlangen 165, s. xiii.; Linz 203. 9, s. xii.; Paris 17161, f. 168b, s. xii. ex.; Rome, Vatican Reg. Christ, 1578, s. xi.

(*c*) On Sedulius, Earl of Leicester, Holkham Hall (Norfolk), 419, s. xi.

(*d*) On Martianus Capella, Avranches 240, ff. 17—101, s. xi.; Cambridge, Univ. Library Mm. 1. 18, s. xiii. (first book only); Cesena, Bibl. Malatestiana, Plut. 16, 1, s. xv.; Dresden Dc. 180, s. xv. (first two books); Florence, Bibl. Laurenziana Plut. 51, 15; 51, 18; 90, 19; Bibl. Magliabechiana, vi. 177, s. xiv/xv. (first two books); Karlsruhe, Aug. Frag. 138, ff. 2, s. x.; Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek Rep. I. fol. 4, ff. 163b-184a, s. xi. (first two books); Rep. I. 4. 71, ff. 1-55, s. xii.; London, Harl. 2506, ff. 86a-93b, s. x., introduction with excerpts from eighth book; Oxford, Bodleian Canon. Misc. 18, s. xi. (first two books); Rome, Vatican lat. 3428, s. xii. (first two books); Ottob. 1516, s. xiii. (on book one); Ottob. 1840, s. xiii.; Vienna Endlicher 330; Wolfenbüttel, Gud. lat. quarto 180, s. x.

(*e*) Extracts from the Commentary on Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* have been printed by H. F. Stewart (*Journ. Theol. Studies*, xvii., 1916, pp. 22-42). As for the Commentary on the same author's *Opuscula Sacra*, Mr. Souter (*ibid.*, ix., 1908, p. 149) appears to doubt the attribution to Remigius, and suggests that Haymo may have been the compiler.

M. Esposito.

[1] Other copies are possibly Bruges, 168, s. xii., and Brussels, 5665, s. xii.

[2] This MS. bears the superscription *Expositio Martiani a Iohanne Scotto cepta*, but the Commentary is that of Remigius.

[3] This MS. is similarly inscribed *Expositio Martiani a Iohanne Scotto excerpta*, and Manitius has wrongly given it as a copy of the work of Johannes (*Gesch.*, i., p. 337).

[4] This MS. has been fully described by the present writer (*Zeits. für celtische Philologie*, ix., 1913, pp. 159-163, and *Didaskaleion*, iii., 1914, pp. 173-181).

ALEUAS AND ALEA.

THE significance of the name of the goddess worshipped at Mantinea and at Tegea, Athena Alea, is correctly interpreted by M. Fougères in *B.C.H.* 16 (1892), p. 573. "Aléa Athèna," he says, "signifie la deésse Aléa, qui ressemble à Athèna. Par cette addition on a voulu marquer les rapports entre la deésse Protectrice d'Arcadie et la deésse tutelaire d'Athènes." He calls attention to the fact that in the language of Homer and Hesiod the Greek word *ἀλέα* denotes 'la protection qui éloigne le mal.'

The appellation of the goddess is derived from the root seen in the verb *ἀλεύω*, 'ward off, keep far away,' seen also in the middle *ἀλέομαι*, 'avoid, shun.' The verb in the active is used several times by the poet Aeschylus, notably in Io's cry, *ἄλευε δᾶ*, and in *Sept.* 141 and in 87, *ἰὼ θεοὶ . . . κακὸν ἀλεύσατε*. In both these passages and in the others in which the word is used the strong apotropaic force of it is apparent. The name Alea is given to Athena in Arcadia in the places mentioned, and according to Mommsen there has been a substitution of the title *Alexandros* for *Alea* in the scholium on Pindar, *Pyth.* 9. 30, in which passage we are told that Adrastus became king of Sicyon, and established the shrine of Hera called Alexandros: *ἐβασίλευσε τῆς Σικυῶνος καὶ τῆς Ἥρας τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καλουμένης ἱερὸν . . . ἱδρύσατο* (see Gruppe, 5. 2. 1126).

It is strange that the name of Aleuas, the prehistoric ancestor of the Thessalian Aleuadae, has not been associated with this root. I have found no attempt to interpret his name except that of Curtius (*Griech. Etym.* 1358, p. 433), who wrongly derives it from *ἀλέω*, 'grind.' Meyer (*Griech. Etym.* 1294-5) distinguishes between *ἀλέϝω* 'avert' and *ἀλέσγω* 'grind,' as Curtius does not. There can be no doubt, it seems to me, that the name Aleuas means the Averter, and that it is to be classed with those names so frequent in the northern parts of the Greek peninsula, Alexander, Amyntas, Amyntor. It is probable that the appellation was attached to Heracles (the ancestor of the Aleuadae according to Pind. *Pyth.* X.) as health-daemon, in which aspect he was worshipped in the country bordering on the Malian Gulf (see Gruppe, 5. 2. 486). Gruppe points to the connexion of Heracles with the group of divine physicians, Asclepius, Amynos, Alexanor, Alkon, Alkathoon, Alkidas, Alkaios, and to the epithets of Heracles *ἀλεξίκακος*, *ἀποτρόπαιος*, *σωτήρ*. He mentions also his connexion with Auge, a birth-goddess, and Hebe, goddess of youth. Further, Heracles appears down to the very end of

antiquity as averter of all evil incantations (see Gruppe, *op. cit.* p. 453 sq.). His activities as Idaean Dactyl (Paus. IX. 27. 8, and IX. 19. 5) point in the same direction.

The myth about Aleuas, told in Aelian *H.A.* 8, 11, brings him into the circle of divine healers of the order of Melampus and Heracles. He is said to have been a young shepherd on Mt. Ossa, with whom a serpent fell in love, kissed his hair, licked his face, and brought him all kinds of gifts. According to Apollodorus 2. 2. 2 Melampus owed his gift of second-sight to a grateful brood of serpents, who, in return for his giving their mother the funeral rite of burning, purified his ears with their tongues, so that he understood the voices of birds and beasts. Melampus in origin is himself a Thessalian (see Wilamowitz, *Isyllos von Epidauros*, 60 and 177) and was also a herdsman.

I count Aleuas as a health-spirit of Thessaly, in all probability closely connected with the Thessalian worship of Heracles Ἀλεξίκακος, ancestor of the Aleuadae according to Pindar.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

LUCAN I. 99-103.

nam sola futuri
100 Crassus erat belli mora. qualiter undas
101 qui secat et geminum gracilis male separat Isthmos,
102 nec patitur conferre fretum : si terra recedat,
103 Ionium Aegaeon frangat mare.

READ thus the simile presents nothing eccentric. In ver. 101 Hosius and Lejay (in his excellent little edition of Book I., published by Klincksieck in 1894) read *male separat*, which not only common sense requires but codd. VUQ authorize : not so Mr. Haskins, who follows a multitude of codd. in offering *mare separat*. But a slight further correction is necessary: to read *Aegaeon* in 103 for the MS. *Aegeo*, 'Withdraw the land, and Aegaean would smash Ionian Sea.' Those who make *Isthmos* the subject of *frangat* cite Stat. *Silu.* IV. iii. 59:

Inous freta miscuisset Isthmos,

but this hardly parallels 'Isthmos would make Aegaean an instrument to smash Ionian Sea.'

Aegaeon (perhaps Lucan actually wrote *Aegaeo*, Latinizing the nominative) must be the subject. For the form *Aegaeon*, *-ōnis*, cf. Stat. *Theb.* V. 288 :

Cycladas Aegaeoni
amplexo,

in Val. Flaccus, *Arg.* I. 629 and IV. 715. Voss and Salmasius correct the *Aegon* of the MSS. to *Aegan* (=*Aegaeon*). The personification, which these forms imply, is suitable where the Aegaean is thought of as a collective force.

GLASGOW. J. S. PHILLIMORE.

ON LVCRETIVS II. 355-360.

at mater uiridis saltus orbata peragrans
†nonquit humi pedibus uestigia pressa bisulcis
omnia conuisens oculis loca si queat usquam
conspicere amissum fetum completque querellis
frondiferum nemus †adsistens et crebra reuisit
ad stabulum desiderio perfixa iuuenci.

356 nonquit O, oinquit Q, linquit Q corr., oinquid G, noscit Lachmann. 359 adsittens OQ, adsistens Q corr.

In the summer of 1919, in the high Sierra of California, I chanced to talk with a cattleman who had driven his herd from the lower valleys to the highlands for summer pasture. When he had arrived at his destination he found a cow missing. He retraced his route, and forty miles below he found the cow by the roadside. Her calf, by reason of its weakness, had been picked up by a waggoner and brought on, and the cow was found at the identical spot where the calf had been taken from the ground; the cow had found the place and had remained there for five days. The occurrence gave rise to a general discussion by the cattlemen present concerning the habits of these animals. When a cow misses her calf she will go by memory to the place where the calf was last seen by her, and will stay there for days; but she will graze and not go hungry herself. The cow will also search by smell; she can smell a herd or the odour left on bushes or that attached to footsteps for hours certainly, possibly for days. The calf also will stay for days where the mother left it. The bereaved cow will try to find her calf first by sight, then by memory, and lastly by smell.

In the light of this expert testimony, *noscit*, in 356, so far as the sense goes, is probable; and in 359 a word meaning 'stopping' is required. According to the cattlemen, Lucretius is accurate in this description, even to what is said in verses 359 and 360.

My proposal *concit* in verse 356 (*Univ. Cal. Class. Phil.* III. 18) may be defended by Sil. VII. 463 'ferebat praedicto sacrae uestigia concita plantae,' and Sid. V. 176 'concita . . . uestigia.'

W. A. Merrill.

University of California.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. XXXIX. 4. 1918.

Elizabeth H. Haight, *An 'Inspired Message' in the Augustan Poets.* Collects and arranges the evidence that Augustus as a part of his political and religious policy associated himself closely with the cult of Apollo, and that this feature is faithfully reflected in the court poets, Vergil as in the fourth *Eclogue* and the sixth *Aeneid;* Horace as in the *Carmen saeculare;* Tibullus in his one national poem on the inauguration of Messalinus as a custodian of the Sibylline books; Propertius in the elegies referring to the Actian Apollo; and Ovid in various connexions. Evan T. Sage, *The Date of the Vatinian Law.* Considers the order of the principal events of the year 59 B.C. and dates them as accurately as possible, the passing of the law being placed at least in the latter half ('possibly in the last third') of the year. J. P. Postgate, *Vindiciae Phaedrianae.* Notes, chiefly exegetical, on some seventeen passages where the fabulist or his text has been criticized without sufficient cause. La Rue Van Hook, *The 'Thought Motif' of Wisdom versus Folly in Greek Tragedy.* In reference to Professor Knapp's paper in *A.J.P.* 37 on the *Antigone* of Sophocles the writer shows that the same motif may be traced in the *Electra* and *Oedipus Tyrannus* of Sophocles and the *Prometheus Bound* of Aeschylus. W. A. Oldfather and A. S. Pease, *On Aeneas Tacticus* and *On the* Κεστοί *of Julius Africanus.* Brief notes on the text of these works. Norman W. De Witt suggests that *praeuaricari* means properly to 'straddle beforehand,' and that to many people *delirare* may have meant to be 'out of plumb.'

XL. 1. 1919.

R. B. Steele, *Curtius and Arrian.* Part I. *The Narrative in Curtius.* Curtius cares more for colour than accuracy in details. He shows many traces of Roman and especially Livian influence. In names he has many peculiarities. His numbers come chiefly from Diodorus, occasionally from Arrian. His chronology and topography are generally inexact. In Verg. *Aen.* I. 574 E. G. Sihler proposes 'Tros Tyrius*ue*: mihi nullo discrimine agetur.'

Atene e Roma. XXI. Oct., Nov., Dec., 1918.

P. Fraccaro, *The* Storia dei Romani *of G. de Sanctis.* [Three volumes have appeared; Vol. III., in two parts, deals with the age of the Punic Wars.] Shows immense learning, insight, and able criticism throughout; the author does not, like Mommsen, alternately attract and repel, but carries the reader with him. [It is interesting to note that De S. revives and strongly supports the theory of Perizonius and Niebuhr that many of the Roman legends arose from primitive epics.] M. C. Mondini, *Private Letters of Roman Egypt.* An account of some of the contents of *Oxyrhynchus Papyri,* Vol. XII. M. Quartana, *Marcia and Cornelia in the Poem of Lucan.* Marcia is thoroughly Stoic, and must be judged in the light of the most rigid form of Stoicism, of which Cato is the great representative. Cornelia, on the other hand, is thoroughly human, 'exquisitely and completely feminine.' Lucan has depicted her with great truth, sympathy, and skill. A. Gandiglio, *Il vecchio di*

Còrico. An Italian translation of *Senex Corycius*, a Latin poem by Pascoli. A. Roscio, *Wool and Looms in Greco-Roman Egypt.* A popular account, mainly gleaned from the papyri. P. Fabbri, *A new Translation of the* Poetica *of Aristotle.* The translation referred to is that of M. Valgimigli (with introduction and notes; Bari, Laterza, 1916), which is described as an important contribution not only to the interpretation of the *Poetic* but to the study of Aristotle and of Greek literature in general. The object of μίμησις, says V., is 'neither reality pure and simple nor something more and better than reality'; it is 'reality according to the law of probability and necessity.' 'Even an event that has actually taken place becomes an object of poetry only in so far as it is conceived as possible according to the law of probability and necessity. All the mistakes of a work of poetry are deviations from that law.' Κάθαρσις consists in 'relief from the terror which gripped and tore the heart during the anxious expectation of the catastrophe'; and also in 'the letting loose of that pity which, held back at first and, as it were, frozen amid the shadows of unknown destiny, now bursts forth and overflows when confronted by the irreparable catastrophe.' Aristotle often shows that he regards some form of ἡδονή as the object of every work of art. The κάθαρσις is the ἡδονή proper to tragedy. Obituary: Giuseppe Pellegrini (A. Taramelli).

Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1918.

Nov. 30. *Jenaer medizin-historische Beiträge.* Hrsg. von Th. Meyer-Steineg. Heft 1-10 (Kind). These studies will interest scholars and archaeologists. H. Lehner, *Die antiken Steindenkmäler des Provinzialmuseums in Bonn* (Anthes).

Dec. 7. B. Schweitzer, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der geometrischen Stile in Griechenland. I.* (Rubensohn). The reviewer gives a long account of this work which he considers very valuable, especially because of the use made of the results of excavations in Palestine.

Dec. 14. G. Kleindienst, *De causa orationis in* Nausimachum et Xenopithem *Demosthenicae* (XXXVIII.) (Rüger). A careful examination of the case. J. Geyser, *Die Erkenntnistheorie des Aristoteles* (H. F. Müller). A detailed study of the subject. E. Schramm, *Die antiken Geschütze der Saalburg* (Anthes). The author has rewritten the treatise published in 1910. It is fully illustrated with ancient representations of artillery and pictures of modern reconstructions. A valuable guide to all that is known on the subject. K. Löschhorn contributes an article on Xen. *An.* I.-III. in which he gives reasons for preferring the text of Sorof (Schülerausgabe, Teubner, 1900) to that of Gemoll. J. Tolkiehn in an article on *Der Titel der rhetorischen Jugendschrift Ciceros* argues (from Quintil. II. 14, 4 *Graeco nomine utatur* and Priscian's *Cicero rhetoricon II.*) that the title of the *De Inuentione* was *Rhetoricon* (not *Rhetoricorum*) *Libri.*

Dec. 21. L. Cohn et S. Reiter, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, Vol. VI., ed. L. C. et S. R. (Stählin). Deserves as high praise as the earlier volumes. Th. Birt, *Aus dem Leben der Antike* (Rossbach). Intended for the general reader but of some value to the specialist. E. Anthes, *Spätrömische Kastelle und feste Städte im Rhein- und Donaugebiet.* Illustrated. X. *Bericht der römisch-germanischen Kommission* (G. Wolff). Includes a useful summary of the work done in recent years and an index. W. Bannier contributes a paper *Zu den attischen Gesetzänderungsgesetzen.*

Dec. 28. Fr. Groehl, *De syntaxi Firmiciana* (Blase). W. Schubert, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (K. Fr. W. Schmidt). The best general work on the subject. Of value to the specialist.

1919. Jan. 4. G. Sandsjoe, *Die Adjektiva auf -αιος, Studien zur griechischen Stammbildungslehre* (Eberhard). I. Sajdak, *Historia critica scholiastarum et commentatorum* Gregorii Nazianzeni. *Pars prima* (Stählin). 'There are more than 800 MSS. which are either described or, at least, classified in this book.'

Jan. 11. G. Przychocky, *De Gregorii Nazianzeni epistulis quaestiones selectae* (Stählin). The writer, who is editing the Letters for the Cracow Academy, discusses their language and style. R. Forrer, *Das römische Zabern, Tres Tabernae* (Anthes). An elaborate study of all the available evidence, fully illustrated; throws light on late Roman fortification. K. Löschhorn contributes a paper, 'Kleine grammatische und kritische Bemerkungen zu Sallust.'

Jan. 18. J. Ruska, *Zur ältesten arabischen Algebra und Rechenkunst* (Wiedemann). The writer is a mathematician and an Orientalist, and is exceptionally well qualified to deal with the difficulties of his subject. O. Rossbach proposes to read in Verg. *Catal.* 14 (6), 9, 'Marmoreusque tibi, *haut* mille coloribus ales.'

Jan. 25. K. H. Meyer, *Perfektive, imperfektive und perfektische Aktionsart im Lateinischen* (Meltzer). E. Assmann contributes a paper, 'Fehlgriffe und neue Wege bei der Erforschung kleinasiatischer Eigennamen.'

Feb. 1. A. Kocevalov, *De μέλλειν verbi constructione apud graecitatis classicae scriptores* (Meltzer). Useful especially for the material collected. W. Kahle, *De vocabulis Graecis Plauti aetate in sermonem Latinum vere receptis* (Klotz). A contribution to the history of the language and civilization of Rome. E. Hermann, *Sachliches und Sprachliches zur idg. Grossfamilie* (Meltzer). On the etymology of a number of words for the relation of various members of a family. A. Bauer, *Die Herkunft der Bastarnen* (Schmidt). The writer seeks to prove that the Bastarnae were Celts.

Feb. 8. K. Brugmann, *Zu den Wörtern für 'heute,' 'gestern,' 'morgen' in den indogermanischen Sprachen* (Hermann). O. Fiebiger und L. Schmidt, *Inschriftensammlung zur Geschichte der Ostgermanen* (Huelsen). A large collection of Greek and Latin Inscriptions down to 565 A.D., with notes based on the careful study of recent works and periodicals. Contributions: K. Brugmann, Homerisch ἐπιτάρροθος, ἐπίρροθος. A. Kunze, *Zu Sallust* Jug. 38, 10, where he proposes to read 'quia mortis metu movebantur' (for 'mutabantur').

Feb. 15. N. Wecklein, *Textkritische Studien zur Ilias* (Drerup). The reviewer gives an interesting summary and criticism of W.'s views. F. Schwenn, *Die Menschenopfer bei den Griechen und Römern* (Fehrle). This book belongs to the series of 'Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten.'

Feb. 22. T. Klee, *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen* (Boesch). The treatise puts together in convenient form the results of recent work on the subject. E. Brall, *Lateinisch* FORIS FORAS *im Galloromanischen* (Meltzer). A study of the use of the words in Latin occupies the first thirteen pages. K. F. Johansen, *Sikyonishe Vaser.* Illustrated (Schweitzer). A Danish work on the vases usually called 'Protocorinthian.' The reviewer, who is about to publish a book entitled 'Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte der geometrischen Stile in Griechenland,' discusses the history of these vases with special knowledge. E. Schwyzer contributes to this number a note in which he suggests that the Σκαιαὶ Πύλαι were so called because the entry bent towards the left and so caused the attacker to expose his right flank. This was the usual plan, and so the epithet meant no more than 'strong.' If this be so we may infer that the poem at one time knew of only one gate to the citadel of Priam, and it was only when the word σκαιαί was mistaken for a proper name that other gates were introduced.

Mar. 1. E. Schwartz, *Zur Entstehung der Ilias* (Eberhard). The study of Wilamowitz' work *Die Ilias und Homer* (1916) caused the author of this little book to think over the problem again. The reviewer gives an interesting sketch of the contents. G. Schütte, *Ptolemy's Maps of Northern Europe.* A reconstruction of the prototypes (Philipp).

Mar. 8. G. Hellmann, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Meteorologie.* Vol. 2 (Boll).

Mar. 15. R. Berndt reviewing, among other school books, C. Stegmann's *Lateinische Schulgrammatik*, discusses the question how far and at what stage historical

grammar should be taught at school. St.'s book is scientifically sound and is well arranged. Ch. Hülsen contributes to this number a paper in which he suggests that the subterranean building discovered in October, 1917, near the Porta Maggiore is the tomb of Antinous.

Apr. 5. M. Jeanneret, *La Langue des Tablettes d'Exécration latines* (Hermann). A complete grammar by a pupil of Niedermann which will be useful to students of Latin and of the Romance languages. These tablets throw light on the language of the people from the first century B.C. to the fifth A.D.

Bodleian Quarterly Record. Vol. II. No. 22.

B. P. Grenfell, *A Latin-Greek Diptych of* A.D. 198. A Latin diptych with Greek signatures acquired in Cairo and presented by Professor Sayce to the Bodleian (Lat. inscr. 10-11). The main portion is: Q. Aemilius Saturninus praef. Aeg. postulante C. Terentio Sarapammo ne Meviae Dionusario e lege Iulia et Titia et ex. s.c. M. Iulium Alexandrum quo ne ab iusto tutore tutela abeat tutorem dedit d.e.r.e.e.b.t.s.s. actum Alex. ad Aeg. viiii Kal. Octobre Saturnino et Gallo cos. anno vii imp. Caesarum L. Septimi Severi Pii Pertinacis Arabici Adiabenici Parthici Maximi et M. Aureli Antonini Augg. mense Thot die xxvi.

Classical Philology. XIV. 1. 1919.

Carl D. Buck, *Words for 'Battle,' 'War,' 'Army,' and 'Soldier.'* A collection of fifty-nine words from I.E. languages with their etymologies. G. M. Calhoun, *Παραγραφή and Arbitration.* Concludes that a παραγραφή could be filed with an arbitrator at any time before the award, that he could quash any παραγραφή obviously evasive, and that, whether filed with him or with the instructing magistrate prior to the reference, it followed the usual course of arbitration. E. T. Merrill, *On the Use by Aldus of his MSS. of Pliny's Letters.* Substantiates in detail Keil's view that Aldus's readings are due far more to conjecture than to faithful reproduction of the lost Paris MS. Chas. Knapp, *References in Plautus and Terence to Plays, Players, and Playwrights.* Deals with words, e.g. *comoedia, tragoedia, tragicomoedia, poeta, fabula, argumentum, actor, choragus, scaena,* and with allusions to the audience, contemporary playwrights and plays not uncommonly burlesqued, etc. E. B. Lease, *The Number Three, Mysterious, Mystic, Magic.* Examples of this perfect number from all periods, with explanatory notes. Tenney Frank, *The Columna Rostrata of C. Duilius.* Argues that the inconsistencies in spelling which have been urged against the genuineness of the inscription may be due to its being restored in the second century B.C. In 'Notes and Discussions' P. Shorey proposes οὐδὲν δεῖ <διὰ> τοῦτο ἀψνοεῖν = 'no need to be perplexed on this account'; and Jas. E. Dunlap suggests that in Pliny, *Ep.* II. 14. 5, *Laudiceni* is to be taken as punning on **laudi-dic-eni* 'praise-speakers.'

XIV. 2. 1919.

A. Shewan, *Scheria-Corcyra* (II.). Argues in favour of a Minoan settlement in Scheria, and urges again the reality of Homeric narrative. H. W. Prescott, *The Antecedents of Hellenistic Comedy* (VI.). Continues his argument against the theory of its Euripidean origin. John A. Scott, *Some Tests of the Relative Antiquity of Homeric Books.* Considers the arguments based on (1) Aeolic Infinitives before the Bucolic Diaeresis, (2) Οὐδέν as Adjective, (3) Hiatus in the Bucolic Diaresis, (4) Frequency of Abstract Nouns. R. B. Steele, *The Method of Arrian in the* Anabasis. Comparative rather than critical. W. L. Westermann, *The Irrigation System of Egypt.* Collection of the scattered notices in papyri and elsewhere from the First Dynasty to the reign of the Roman Emperor Probus. Paul Shorey, *On δέ γε in Retort.* A full account of this combination of particles, which marks sharp contrast or continues with emphasis. In 'Notes and Discussions' A. S. Pease suggests that in Cicero,

De consulatu II. 30, *lapsu* means 'failure,' and that the reference in *ea*, etc., is to the events foretold by the portents in the *Bellum Octauianum* of 87.

Classical Weekly (New York). 1919.

Feb. 10. E. Bourne, *A Study of Tibur* (Winter). From the data of the CIL. the life of a municipal town is reconstructed.

Feb. 24. C. H. Moore, *Pagan Ideas of Immortality during the Early Roman Empire* (Hadzsits). J. O. Lofberg, *Sycophancy in Athens* (van Hook).

Mar. 3. Dr. E. Riess and Professor C. Knapp discuss the number and arrangement of the pictures described in *Aen.* I. 466-493.

Mar. 10. G. M. Stratton, *Theophrastus and the Greek Physiological Psychology before Aristotle* (C. K.). This work includes text and translation of the fragment *De Sensibus*, and comments by Professor A. E. Taylor.

Mar. 17. Lane Cooper, *The Greek Genius and its Influence* (C. K.). Material for the study of ancient classics in translations.

Mar. 24. E. L. White, *The Vestal Virgins*. This paper studies the sources and supplies a bibliography. W. S. Messer, *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy* (McCartney). T. R. Glover, *From Pericles to Philip* (Ferguson). 'A delightful book.'

Mar. 31. J. L. Hancock, *Studies in Stichomythia* (Bassett). A minute study of the particles in dialogue. E. P. Franklin discusses the possible corruption of the text of Plautus and Terence through the reproduction of manuscripts by dictation.

Apr. 7. F. H. Fowler discusses 'Latin Adjectival Clauses with the Subjunctive,' maintaining that in such clauses the modal meaning is never lost.

Apr. 21. G. Murray, *Religio Grammatici* (Messer). 'This lecture . . . might well form the *credo* of any classicist who wishes to teach and to write with enthusiasm and inspiration.'

May 12. T. Dempsey, *The Delphic Oracle* (Hewitt). A convenient summary.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome. II. 1918.

This volume contains 98 pages of letter-press as against 167 pages in Vol. I. But it has 70 plates as against 54; 45 of these illustrate the work of Pietro Cavallini. The Istituto Italiano d'Arti Grafiche shows no diminution in the beauty of its printing notwithstanding the nearness of Bergamo to the seat of war.

There are three articles dealing with classical subjects:

1. *Terracotta arulae*, by E. Douglas Van Buren. 'These arulae originate with the Greek colonies; they are not found however on the Greek mainland, and must therefore reveal a usage and, possibly, a cult either purely local or brought from somewhere other than the mother-country of the settlers. The subjects represented are schemes common to Oriental art, and here the Loryma basis comes to our assistance: for it shows that precisely on an altar basis just such subjects were treated. Presumably, then, the Greek colonists knew of the use of sculptured altars as tomb monuments in Asia Minor at any rate, if not in Greece proper, and in their new homes they perpetuated this form of memorial, but in miniature, depositing it *within* instead of *upon* the tomb. Although this was the original purpose of the arulae, it is easily conceivable that they were soon also dedicated as ex-votos in sanctuaries, or even employed in houses for commemorative or domestic cults, which would account for their presence in temples and dwelling-houses.'

2. *The Gallic Fire and Roman Archives*, by Lucy G. Roberts. It is the purpose of this paper to determine, so far as possible, the effect of the Gallic invasion on the archives of the city. In the descriptions of the rebuilding of the city by Diodorus, Livy, Plutarch, the work on private houses is most emphasized, though Livy and Plutarch speak of the restoration of the temples. But 'there is a striking absence of explicit notices both in regard to the destruction and rebuilding of the city. . . . The

emphasis on the *expiatio*, in the description of the rebuilding given by Livy and Plutarch, as well as the fact that the restoration of the temples could take place in such wholesale fashion, seems to indicate that the need of reconstruction and purification was greater than that of rebuilding.' Archaeological evidence seems to show that some at least of the temples escaped destruction. The temple of Saturn was dedicated 498 B.C., not restored till 42 B.C. Such is the tradition, and it is confirmed by the remains. We find the type of construction which is found in pre-Gallic buildings, and the type found in the time of Augustus, but none belonging to the intervening period. Of the temple of Castor, tradition says that it was dedicated in 484 B.C. and restored (first) in 117 B.C. Here again we find remains of construction of a similar character to that found in other buildings of these dates and no trace of any intermediate building. There are several temples for whose survival there is other evidence than that of the extant remains. The temple of Dius Fidius Semo Sancus, dedicated 466 B.C., stood till the second century A.D. without any recorded restoration. Dionysius says he saw in this temple the treaty concluded with Gabii by Tarquinius Superbus. As it is unlikely that this document would have been restored, if destroyed in 387, it seems probable that the treaty and the temple both survived. As to the temple of Diana on the Aventine founded by Servius Tullius, Dionysius says that the bronze pillar on which the treaty then made with the Latins was inscribed survived in the temple to his time. Pliny believed that certain statues belonged to the pre-Gallic period. The antiquity of some of these seems reasonably certain. 'The evidence points to the survival of the temples of Saturn, Dius Fidius, Diana, Ceres, and perhaps of Juno. This regard for temples, on the part of the Gauls, is entirely in keeping with their characteristic religiosity. . . . Probably almost all of the international documents deposited on the Capitoline and in the other temples escaped destruction. Of the other records, the *leges* in the temple of Saturn probably survived, as well as the *senatus consulta*. In this connection, the large number of early *leges* and *senatus consulta* known is of interest.'

3. *Studies in the Archaeology of the Forum at Pompeii*, by A. W. Van Buren These notes 'are believed to possess a certain value in part as correcting traditional statements about well-known monuments, and in part as calling attention to matters of interest which have long passed unobserved.'

Revue de Philologie. XLI. 3. 1917.

P. Hippolyte Boussac, *L'Exil de Juvénal et l'Ombos de la XV^me^ Satire*. Maintains that J. was exiled to the oasis of El-Khargeh in Egypt. He would probably have embarked at Puteoli for Alexandria, and have travelled to Canopus and thence up the Nile to Tentyris. While there he learnt the story which forms the subject of *Sat.* XV. Ombos is to be identified with the ruins of Kôm-Belal, excavated by Petrie and Quibell in 1895. P. Lejay, *Essais et Notes sur Virgile*. Discusses (1) Ampsanctus; (2) ara Palici (IX. 585); (3) the five elements in X. 100-102 are described in terms of Pythagoreanism; (4) the neutrality of the gods in X. 108; (5) the use of *quin* in X. 614; (6) denies Warde-Fowler's doctrine (Vergil's *Gathering of the Clans*, p. 65) that Vergil repeats the same imagery in the same simile; (7) Vergil's employment of nocturnal scenes and moonlight effects; (8) a discussion of the means by which the sense of the middle voice was expressed in Latin. An elaboration of Barbelenet's view that some compound verbs have the force of a middle, e.g. *adcurare* = 'to give oneself the trouble'; (9) the passive participles of intransitive verbs, e.g. *regnatus*, *triumphatus*. REVIEWS: J. W. White, *Scholia on the* Aves *of Aristophanes* (G. Méantis). Favourable, but some of the statements and hypotheses in the book are 'parfaitement en l'air.' C. H. Moore, *The Religious Thought of the Greeks* (A. Laumonier). A useful summary, but 'ne vise pas à l'originalité.'

XLII. 3. 1918.

A. Ernout, *Cas en -e- et cas en -i- de la troisième declension dans Lucrèce.* P. Jourdan, *Notes de critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus.* Summaries of French and English periodicals published in 1917.

XLII. 4.

P. Jourdan, *Notes de Critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus.* Review of E. M. Dutton, *Studies in Greek Prepositional Phrases.* Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. Contains summaries of English and Italian periodicals published in 1917. Revue des comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique. Comptes rendus parus en 1915.

Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1918.

Nov. 11. J. W. Kohl, *De chorizontibus* (Stürmer). Shrewdly written. Richtsteig, *Libanius qua ratione Platonis operibus usus sit* (Asmus). Highly recommended by the reviewer.

Nov. 25. Axel Boëthius, *Die Pythais* (W. Larfeld). Discusses with acuteness questions connected with the Athenian sacrifice of the Pythais. E. Schröder, *Plotins Abhandlung πόθεν τὰ κακά*, Enn. I. 8 (Dibelius). Helpful.

Dec. 9. M. Goebel, *Ethnica.* I. (Fr. Cauer). Th. Schermann, *Die allgemeine Kirchenordnung des 2. Jahrhunderts* (Dibelius). The reviewer does not agree with the attempt to ascribe the earliest possible dates to the texts.

Dec. 23. S. Eitrem, *Beiträge zur griechischen Religionsgeschichte.* II. Kathartisches and Rituelles (Nestle). Often stimulating. G. Dürks, *De Severiano Gabalitano* (Koch).

1919. Jan. 20. T. v. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, *Die dramatische Technik des Sophokles* (Draheim). J. van Wageningen, *Senecas* Phaedra (Gemoll).

Feb. 3. Fr. Boll, *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung* (Nohl). A short and clear treatment.

Feb. 17. Wohlrab-Lamer, *Die altklassische Welt* (Jäckel). E. Herdi, *Die Herstellung und Verwertung von Käse im griechisch-römischen Altertum* (Blümner).

Mar. 3. O. Stählin, *Editionstechnik* (Bock). A practical handbook. R. Cagnat, *Cours d'Epigraphie latine.* 4th ed. (Baug). Reviewed in much detail in this and the two following numbers.

Mar. 17. M. A. Schwartz, *Erechtheus et Theseus apud Euripidem et Atthidographos* (Busche). The writer shows good judgment, and does not avoid difficult questions.

Apr. 14. A. Hartmann, *Untersuchungen über die Sagen vom Tod des Odysseus* (Drerup). The reviewer considers the results unproven. Chr. Jensen, *Neoptolemos u. Horaz* (Kroll). P. v. d. Mühll, *Der Rhythmus im antiken Vers* (Draheim). The proof is inadequate.

Apr. 28. F. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* (Viereck). Shows industry and common sense. N. A. Βέης, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des peloponnesischen Klosters* Mega Spilaeon. I. (Boll).

May 12. O. Wichmann, *Platos Lehre von Instinkt und Genie* (Nestle). Interesting and suggestive. L. Radermacher, *Hippolytos und Thekla* (Svoboda). Shows deep appreciation.

May 26. N. Wecklein, *Textkritische Studien zur* Ilias (Brandt). W. A. Baehrens, *Cornelius Labeo atque eius commentarius Vergilianus* (Wessner). The work indicates many correspondences between Labeo and the Virgilian scholia.

June 9. M. Åkerman, *Über die Echtheit der letzteren Hälfte von Tertullians* Aduersus Iudaeos (Koch). In future Tertullian will be out of court for the authorship of cap. 9-14.

June 23. W. Schubart, *Einführung in die Papyruskunde* (Zucker). The writer is a complete master of his material.

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

A.

ABERCIUS, inscription of, 56
Actoris in the *Odyssey*, 1 ff.
Agar (**T. L.**), notes on the *Birds* of Aristophanes, 155 ff.
on the *Ecclesiazusae*, 12 ff.
Alcinous, humour and satire in the portrayal of, 57 ff.
Aldhelm glosses in the Corpus glossary, 89 ff.
Aleuas and Alea, 170 f.
anagnorisis, 53
Analogist and Anomalist Controversy, the, 24 ff.
corrigenda on, 88
Archives, Roman, and the Gallic fire, 178 f.
Aristophanes, notes on the *Birds* of, 155 ff.
the *Ecclesiazusae* of, 12 ff.
Aristotle's *Poetics*, Vaglimigli's translation of, 175
Arrius (Catull. 84), 110
Arulae, terracotta, 178
Atlantis, identified with Minoan Crete, 8 f.
Augustus and the cult of Apollo, 174
autumn in Roman poetry, 54

B.

ΒΑΔΗΝ and ΔΡΟΜΩΙ in Greek historians of the fifth century, 40 ff.
Bassett (**S. E.**), Actoris in the *Odyssey*, 1 ff.
Bastarnae, the, 176
Bradley (**H.**), remarks on the Corpus Glossary, 89 ff.
Brettia, Island of, 4

C.

Caligula, fable aimed at, 83 ff.
'canon,' history of the term, 35 f.
Castor, temple of, 179
'Catholic,' history of the term, 34 f.
Catullus, *mulier aries*, and other *cruces* in, 134 ff.
Cicero's *de Inuentione*, title of, 175
Clemens (**G. T.**), note on *conspicior* in Liv. X. (43), 88
'college of singers,' a Milesian, 55
Colo, the cognomen, 79 f.
Colson (**F. H.**), the Analogist and Anomalist Controversy, 24 ff.
corrigenda on, 88
conspicior in Liv. X. 43, note on, 88
Cornelia, 174
Corpus Glossary, remarks on the, 89 ff.
Crete, Minoan, identified with Homer's *Scheria* and Plato's *Atlantis*, 8 f.
Curtius, 174
Cyclopes, 67

D.

dative, the Indo-European, 53
Delphian chronology, 53
Dexia, the gens, 79
Dioscuri, the, Idas and Lynceus, 22 f.
Diptych, a Latin-Greek, of A.D. 198, 177

E.

Ecclesiazusae, notes on the, 12 ff.
Elysium, 66
Ennius and the Punic Wars, 113 ff.
Erasistratus, 86
Esposito (**M.**), a ninth-century commentary on Phocas, 165 ff.
Euripides, *Rhesus* 720, 153 f.
Eurycleia and Eurynome in the *Odyssey*, 2 f.
Eustathius, 122 ff.

F.

Fay (**Edwin W.**), the phonetics of *MR-* in Latin, 37 ff.
Ferguson (**A. S.**), Plato, *Republic* 321B, 163 ff.
ferrymen of the Dead, 4
finger-doccan (Anglo-Saxon), 105
future participle in Latin, origin of the, 55

G.

Gallic Fire, the, and Roman archives, 178
Garrod (**H. W.**), 'Lombardic,' 51 f.
Gigantes, 67
glosses in the text of Sophocles, 118 ff.
Gow (**A. S. F.**), notes on Theocritus, 20 ff.
grammatical terminology, influence of, on Christian thought and language, 36
Greek adjectives ending in *-ης*, 141 ff.
ε-stem nouns, 142 ff.
neuters in *-ος*, 148
rhetors, notes on the, 129 ff.
Greene (**Herbert W.**), notes on the Greek rhetors, 129 ff.

H.

Hardy (E. G.), *lectio senatus* and *census* under Augustus, 43 ff.
Professor Elmore's hypotheses, 49 ff.
Horace, *Ep.* I. (4), 109
Housman (A. E.), notes on Martial, 68 ff.
siparum and *supparus*, 149 ff.
How (W. W.), on the meaning of *βάδην* and *δρόμῳ* in Greek historians of the fifth century, 40 ff.

J.

Juvenal, exiled to Egypt, 179

L.

Labeo, Cornelius, 180
lectio senatus and *census* under Augustus, 43 ff.
Lindsay (W. M.), '*puncto tempore*,' 19
Livy X. 43, note on *conspicior* in, 88
'Lombardic,' 51 f.
Lucan I. 99-103, 172
Marcia and Cornelia in, 174
Lucretius II. 355-360, 173

M.

Macurdy (Grace H.), Aleuas and Alea, 170 f.
maid-servants of Penelope, the, 2 f.
Marcia, 174
Martial, notes on, 68 ff.
Matthaei, L. E., 'Studies in Greek Tragedy,' reviewed, 112
McKenzie (Roderick), Greek adjectives ending in *-ης*, 141 ff.
Merrill (W. A.), on Lucretius II. 355-360, 173
mulier aries and other *cruces* in Catullus, 14 ff.
Munro (J. A. R.), Thucydides on the third of August, 431 B.C., 127 f.
Mussetius, 80

N.

negative prefix, *ἀνα-* as compound, 53

P.

Pearson (A. C.), some glosses in the text of Sophocles, 118 ff.
Phaeacia, 'fairyland' theories of, 4 ff., 61 ft.
was it Minoan Crete? 8 ff.
identified with real places, 10 f.
Phaeacians, satire in the account of the, 60
ships of the, 62 ff.
Phaedriana, 81 ff.
Phaedrus, date of the, 55
Phillimore (J. S.), Lucan I. 99-103, 172
Phocas, a ninth-century commentary on, 165 ff.
phonetics of *MR-* in Latin, the, 37 ff.
Plato, *Republic* 421B, 163 ff.
order of the dialogues, 55, 56
Platt (Arthur), Euripides, *Rhesus* 720, 153 f.
Portus Lunae, 109
Postgate (J. P.), Phaedriana, 81 ft.
Professor Elmore's hypotheses, 49 ff.
Ptolemy IV. (Philopator), 112
puncto tempore (*-ris*), 19

R.

Remigius of Auxerre, 166
Rhadamanthys in the *Odyssey*, 65
Richmond (O. L.), *mulier aries* and other *cruces* in Catullus, 134 ft.
Roman legends, primitive epics the source of, 174

S.

Saalburg, the, 175
Saktideva, 5
scaed (Anglo-Saxon), 107
Scheria of the *Odyssey*, the, 4 ff., 57 ff.
Seneca's Tragedies, 112
shaving by singeing, 20
Shewan (A.), the Scheria of the *Odyssey*, 4 ft, 57 ff.
siparum and *supparus*, 149 ff.
Sitalces, 128
Σκαιαὶ πύλαι, 176
Sophocles, some glosses in the text of, 118 ff.
Steuart (Ethel Mary), Ennius and the Punic Wars, 113 ff.
Stratonice, 86
subjunctive after *quisquis*, 73 f.
Suidas, a fragment of art-criticism in, 56
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 53 ff., 109 ff., 174 ff.
American Journal of Philology, 53, 174
Atene e Roma, 109, 174 f.
Athenaeum (Pavia), 109
Berliner philologische Wochenschrift, 110, 174 ff.
Bodleian Quarterly Record, 177
Classical Philology, 54, 177 f.
Classical Weekly, 55, 110 f., 178
Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, 178 f.
Mnemosyne, 55
Rassegna Italiana, 110 f.
Revue de Philologie, 56, 112, 179 f.
Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica, 112
Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie, 56, 180

T.

Taurini, the, 112
temperaments, the four, 55
terracotta *arulae*, 178
Theocritus, notes on, 20 ff.
Theophrastus, *Characters* of, 111 f.
Thucydides on the third of August, 431 B.C., 127 f.
Thucydides' *History*, divisions of, 111
Tres Tabernae, 176

V.

Vatinian Law, date of, 174
Vergilian Codex F, 112

Z.

Zeus invoked at beginning and end of poems, 21
zodiac, astrological divisions of the, 77

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

A.

Aeschylus :—
Eum. (486) 121
Theb. (448) 119
Aristophanes :—
Aues (11, 16) 155, (63, 161, 168) 156, (178, 180, 244 *sqq.*, 268) 157, (275, 494, 537) 158, (546, 555, 566, 600, 660, 753) 159, (807, 812, 823, 841, 850, 1081, 1146, 1190) 160, (1221, 1273, 1376, 1441, 1501) 161, (1562, 1608, 1615) 162
Eccl. (234, 292) 12, (307-8, 365, 382) 13, (404, 420, 462) 14, (473, 482, 503, 508, 514, 556) 15, (628, 629, 633, 643, 649, 663) 16, (773, 775, 795, 802 *sqq.*) 17, (836, 864, 891) 18, (912, 1166 *sq.*) 19
Nubes (69, 70) 164
Vesp. (710) 133
Aristotle :—
Poet. 1455a (12-16), 54

C.

Catullus :—
i. (9) 136 ff. ; xxv. (5) 134 ; xxix (20 *sqq.*) 135 f. ; XI. (9 *sqq.*) 136 ; lv. (17) 137 f. ; lxvi. (15) 137 ; lxviii.*a* and lxviii.*b*, 138 ff.
Cicero :—
ad Att. xv. 9 (1), 53
ad. Q. frat. ii. 9 (3), 72
de consul. ii. (30), 178
de Sen. (27, *coll. de Off.* iii. 57), 73 f.
Corpus Inscrr. Lat. :—
IX. (p. 422), 45 xi. (6167) 46

D.

Dio Cassius :—
(52, 42) 45, (53, 1) *ib.*, (54, 10) 46, (54, 28, 30, 35) 47, (55, 6, 12) *ib.*, (55, 13, 14) 48, (56, 28) 49

E.

Ennius :—
Ann. fr. (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6) 114, (7, 8) 115
Euripides :—
Rhesus (720) 153 f.

H.

Horace :—
Epp. I (4) 109

L.

Livy :—
XXI. (38) 112
XXVI. (51) 115 *sq.*
Lucan :—
I. (99 *sqq.*), 172
VII. (381), 78
Lucilius :—
(68, 472) 19
Lucretius :—
ii. (263) 19 ; (355 *sqq.*) 173 ; iv. (214) 19 ; vi. (230), 19

M.

Martial :—
i. 68, 68 f. ; iii. 20 (1 *sqq.*), 69 f. ; v. 16 (5 *sqq.*) 70. ; 66, 71 ; vi. 14, 71 f. ; 29 (7 *sq.*) 73 f. ; viii. 56 (17 *sqq.*) 74 , ix. 20 (5 *sq.*) 75 ; 99, 75 f. ; x. 24, 76 ff. ; xii. 59, 78 ff. ; 95 (1) 80
Mon. Ancyr. ii. (2-11) 43 ff.

N.

Nonnos :—
Dionys. 26 (1), 37 (608), 131

P.

Phaedrus :—
III. *prol.* (34 *sqq.*) 69
Nouae Fabulae (Thiele, No. XXIII.), 81 f. ; LXX. (Phaedr. IV. xiv), 82 ff. ; (XCIV.), 82
Pindar :—
Pyth. 9 (30) Schol., 170
Plato :—
Rep. (421*b*) 163 ff.
Plautus :—
Capt. (862) 112
Pliny the Younger :—
Ep. ii. 14 (5), 177
Plutarch :—
Vit. Pyrrh. (15) 115 ; (23, 25) 116

R.

Rhetors (ed. Spengel) :—
Alexander, 3 (32, 39, 40) 132
Anon., 5 (119) 130 f., (149 *coll.* Plut. 2, 1097*c*) 130, (172) 133, (210, *coll.* Theon 2. 81) 130
Apthonius, 2 (34) 130
Choeroboscus, 3 (255, *coll.* Anon., 3. 214) 132
Cocondrius, 3 (233) 130
Cornutus, (433) 133, (435, *coll.* Cebes 13) 131, (440, 452, 458 *coll.* Clem. Al. 308, Ulp. Dem. 9. 6) 133, (459) 131

Longinus, (300) 130, (315) 219
Menander, 3 (348, 413) 131, (442) 130
Phoebammon, 3 (54 *coll.* Anon. 3, 141) 130, (55½ *sq.*) 132
Theon, 2 (71, 83) 130
Tiberius, 3 (71) 129
Trypho, 3 (194) 129, (198) 133, (199 *coll.* Cornutus 439, Longin. 264, Dem. Phal. 3, 307, Arist. *Rhet.* 3. 10. 139, 141) 129
Zonaeus, 3 (166) 133

S.

Sallust :—
Iug. 38 (10) 176
Seneca :—
Med. 59, 70
Tro. 52, 78
Sophocles :—
Ai. (196) 118, (680) 126, (966) 122 f.
Ant. (223) 120, (368) 124, (446, 527) 118, (966, 1246 *sqq.*) 125
El. (164) 118, 642) 126, (686) 124, (800) 118, (947) 120
fr. (279, 581) 119, (800) 120
O.C. (1068 *sqq.*) 118 f.
O.T. (87 *sq.*) 120, (276 *coll.* Eur. *Hipp.* 657, Aesch. *Eum.* 486) 121, (425) 126, (476) 119, (685, 1031) 120, (1507) 126
Statius :—
Silu. I. 6. (39 *sqq.*) 70
Suetonius :—
Aug. (27) 44, (37) 48
Tib. (21), 48
Suidas :—
s.v. Σεβαστιανός, 56

T.

Tacitus :—
Dial. 6 (9 *sqq.*) 110
Theocritus :—
xi. (50 *sqq.*) 20 f. ; xvii. (1 *sqq.*) 21 f. ; xxii. (177 *sqq.*) 22 f.
Thucydides :—
ii. (28) 127 f.

V.

Virgil :—
Aen. i. (574) 174 ; viii. (588) 88
Catal. 14 (9) 176

III.—INDEX VERBORVM.

A.—GREEK.

A.

ἀγχίθεοι, 61
ἀθερές, 145
ἀιδής, 145
αἰσχύνομαι, with acc. of persons, 'blush before,' 13
ἀλέκτωρ, 'averter of evil,' 54
ἀλεύω, ἀλέομαι, 170
ἀλής, 146
ἀμπυκτήρια, 119
ἀνα-, compound negative prefix, 53
ἀτειρής, 146
αὔλειος, 16
ἀφραδής, 145

B.

βάδην, 40 ff.

Γ.

γλεῦκος, 123

Δ.

δρόμῳ, 40 ff.

E.

ἕνα = ἕνα ἕκαστον, 23
ἐρινεός, 5 n.
ἐξισοῦν (Soph.), 125 f.
ἑστιάτωρ, 163
εὐσταθής, 146

K.

κάθαρσις, 175
καθολικός (Gramm.), 33 f.
κανών (Gramm.), 35 f.
κατά, 'against,' 119
κεκονιμένος (Aristoph.), 12 f.

M.

μίμησις, 175
μνηστεύομαι νίκην, 131

N.

νῖκος (Hellen.), 147

Π.

παραγραφή, 177
(?) παροδέω, 131
πηγής, 145
πόλιν ὑφαίνειν, 15
προσαπόδοσις, 132

Σ.

Σκαιαὶ πύλαι, 176
σπουδή, 121

Υ.

ὑγιής, 145

Φ.

(?) φιλοτητάριον, 18

B.—LATIN.

A.

adcurare, 179
antiquus Iuppiter, 70 f.
aptare, 87
arcus, 'arc,' 77

B.

biothanatas (Aldhelm), 102
brat., 37

C.

clasma (Aldhelm), 100
conspectus, 88

D.

delirare, 174

E.

emendare, 109
excludo, 54

F.

falcifer Tonans, 70
fides, 145
forma, 40
formica, 38
formido, 38
fretus, 37

G.

glandem cenat, 87

L.

lapsus, 178
Laudiceni, 177
logi, 'fables,' 69

M.

muneris auctor, 76

O.

occasus, 19

P.

praeuaricari, 174
professiones, 50 f.
proprius, sacrificial term, 112
puncto tempore (*-ris*), 19
pupula duplex, 54

Q.

quisquis, with 2 sing. subjunct., 73 f.

R.

recensus, 49 f.
rediuiua, 're-dyed,' 100

S.

sic = talis, 71
siparum, *sipharum*, 150 f.
supparus, 151 f.
stupor dentium (med.), 106

T.

taratrum, 'auger' (Mediev.), 107

V.

(?) *uiriuola*, 108
uirum putabo, 71 ff.

BILLING AND SONS, LTD., PRINTERS, GUILDFORD, ENGLAND

GETTY CENTER LIBRARY
3 3125 00613 3975